

RAILWAYS ACT, 1921.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE RAILWAY
RATES TRIBUNAL.

THE FORMS OF SCHEDULE OF CHARGES FOR
THE CONVEYANCE OF WORKMEN.
ORDINARY SEASON TICKET RATES.
TRADERS' SEASON TICKET RATES.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 30TH, 1923.

SECOND DAY.



LONDON :

PRINTED & PUBLISHED BY HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
To be purchased through any Bookseller or directly from H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE
at the following addresses: Imperial House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2, and
28 Abingdon Street, London, S.W.1; York Street, Manchester;
1 St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff; or 120 George Street, Edinburgh.

1923

Price 4s. 0d. Net.

00566421

PROCEEDINGS OF THE RAILWAY RATES TRIBUNAL.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 30TH, 1923.

PRESENT :

W. B. CLODE, Esq., K.C. (*President*).

W. A. JEPSON, Esq.

GEO. C. LOCKET, Esq., J.P.

SECOND DAY.

MR. BRUCE THOMAS and MR. A. TYLOR (instructed by the Hon. Solicitors) appeared for the Railway Companies' Association.

MR. HENRY G. PURCHASE appeared for the National Association of Railway Travellers.

THE HON. R. STAFFORD CRIPPS appeared for the London County Council.

MR. DEW appeared for the National Association for the Promotion of Cheap Transit.

MR. WILLIAM STRANG, MR. ALFRED BROWN, and MR. JOSHUA WINTERBOTTOM appeared on behalf of the Monmouthshire and South Wales Coal Owners' Association.

MR. H. J. DAVIS appeared as a Season Ticket holder.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I do not know whether it would be convenient for me to call my evidence now and finish my remarks afterwards, because my witness is rather anxious to get away; I am only going to call one witness.

President: That will not embarrass you, Mr. Bruce Thomas?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Not at all, Sir.

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT, SWORN.

Examined by MR. STAFFORD CRIPPS.

315. You are the Valuer of the London County Council and head of the Valuation Estates and Housing Department?—I am.

316. You are the officer responsible for the management of the Council's housing estates?—Yes.

317. You advise the Council on all housing questions generally and the question of transport facilities connected with them?—That is so.

318. I want you to state, if you will, what the attitude of the County Council is in coming here and putting forward these proposals?—The Council as the housing authority for London is very concerned as to the conditions in London itself, and they are, from their experience, which goes back a large number of years, convinced that linked with the housing question practically the most important item is that of transport.

319. It is the most important matter that you have to deal with with regard to housing?—As a public authority the Council are principally concerned with that class which is generally covered by the title "workmen." There is no definition of it which is very clear, and one has really been driven to take for this purpose people occupying a house of a certain size. According to the census of 1911 (I have not analysed it so closely for the 1921 figures which have only just recently been available in the greatest detail) something over three-quarters of the population of London itself occupy the smaller tenements of the census. When one examined the area beyond the County of London, that is within the Metropolitan Police District, for something like 12 miles radius from Charing Cross, one found that the percentage of people living in that area was only just a little less than the percentage living in London.

320. *President:* You mean the percentage living in the small houses?—In the smaller houses, yes—what we call the tenements, up to four or five rooms.

321. *Mr. Stafford Cripps:* Is the question of the distribution of the working class population outside London, which you have just spoken of, a matter of growing or increasing urgency?—It is growing. As one always knows, the typical instance is that of the City of London, which at one time was practically self-contained. Even from the early days of the 19th century there was an indication that the population of the City was disappearing, and it was becoming increasingly business and industrial, so that to-day I think I am right in saying that the population in the square mile of the City, which at one time was largely residential, is now only some 12,000 people. That tendency has been growing beyond the City boundaries, and now there are about 12 Boroughs around the City where a permanent diminution in the resident population has definitely set in owing to the industrialism of those 12 Boroughs, which previously were the residential areas for persons employed principally in the City of London.

322. You have got out a table, I think, "F.H. 1"; have you got that before you?—Yes.

(Document handed in.)

323. Perhaps you will just explain what you want to show by that table?—"F.H. 1" shows the growth of the population of outer London, which would not form the Greater London—practically the Metropolitan Police District. It will be seen from that that the ratio of growth of population of London itself has been slackening off until it has got to the stage where at the two last census enumerations there has in fact been a reduction in the total population of London, whereas the outer London ring has gone on increasing, although the last census showed a slackening of the rate of increase. Apart altogether from those figures, there is something which is not disclosed by totals, that from the inner districts there is a drift towards the outer districts of

30 May, 1923.]

Mr. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

the London Area itself of at any rate something not less than 10,000 a year; so that in the census period there is a shift from the inner boroughs to the outer boroughs of London itself of 100,000 population.

324. That population, I suppose, has to be carried for the purposes of its work?—All these people, and I think I may say the whole of the wage-earners or nearly the whole of them in outer London and a substantial number in the districts beyond the Greater London have interests in London itself, and they travel to London for the purposes of their employment.

325. And now, as the County Council have to consider this problem of housing, do they have to consider distances which are increasing from the centre?—Yes. As a study of the figures shows, in the early days of the railways the development of the districts, even in the County of London, was very sparse. People simply walked from Camberwell and Peckham to their work. Then came the days of the bus; and when the railways developed you notice a tremendous jump forward in the development of the outer districts. That has gone on very markedly. Every time there has been an improvement in transport facilities there has been a jump forward in the development of the districts further from the centre.

326. I think you have got some figures which are not on one of these sheets (I did mention them to the Tribunal yesterday) as to the distances from which workmen's tickets are used coming into London?—Yes.

327. These are figures which were in the Board of Trade Report for 1912. Yes. Of course they are ancient history now. I should expect to find the figures very much larger to-day, but there has been no census so far as I know similar to this—certainly not published. No doubt the railway companies have information, but they have not published it, and it is not available to me. These were indications of the distances at that time showing that between 6 and 8 miles from Charing Cross the largest number were passengers with workmen's tickets, and a very large number between 8 and 10.

328. Perhaps it would be convenient to the Tribunal if I read out the figures. The distances are from Charing Cross. The first column gives the average daily number of passengers in October, 1911, travelling with workmen's tickets.

Mr. Jepson: That does not mean to and from Charing Cross Station?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Yes.

Mr. Jepson: On the South Eastern and Chatham?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Yes. The second column gives other passengers travelling, which would be, as to the majority, probably third class and first class seasons; we are not concerned with those. From 4 to 6 miles there were 17,277.

Mr. Lockett: Those are workmen?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Yes; I will not give you the other figures; I have got them, but I do not think they are material. Then from 6 to 8 miles there were 51,970; from 8 to 10 miles 26,222; from 10 to 12 miles 6,520; from 12 to 15 miles 1,635; from 15 to 20 miles 1,530; from 20 to 25 miles 150, and from 25 to 30 miles none.

Mr. Jepson: Is that daily or weekly?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: This is the average daily number in October, 1911, so that the figures are 12 years' old, but they are the last published returns.

329. There has been some question about your having to provide for or see to the provision of transport facilities for the London County Council Estates. Is it a fact that you regard yourselves as responsible for something a great deal more than your own Estates?—Yes. London's attitude is not that of the owners of estates desiring railway facilities for the development of that area; that is only a small part of the problem with which they have to deal. The trouble for London is the degree of overcrowding which exists in the central districts, and when one remembers that on the basis of the census of 1921 there are nearly 3,000,000 out of a population of 4,500,000 people living

in one to four room tenements, and that of those nearly 700,000 of them are living overcrowded in conditions on an average of more than two persons per room, the problem of distributing the population of London is an enormous one.

330. Mr. Lockett: You say that nearly 3,000,000 are living in one room tenements?—No, from one to four room tenements; there are 3,000,000 out of 4,500,000, and of those nearly 700,000 are living in overcrowded conditions of, on an average, more than two persons to a room.

331. Mr. Stafford Cripps: While you are on that point I think it would assist the Tribunal if you would give them the figures which appear at the bottom of page 6?—I was giving the figure for 1921.

332. I think perhaps if you would give the exact figures from the census from 1891 so as to show the trend, that would be convenient?—In 1891 there were, in round figures, 2,340,000 living in one to four room tenements of which 832,000 about were living in overcrowded conditions, and that, for this purpose, means more than an average of two persons per room. In 1901 the population in one to four room tenements was, in round figures, 2,450,000 persons, and 726,000 of them were living in overcrowded conditions.

333. You might give the percentages so as to make it clear?—The first percentage is 35.6 overcrowded; in 1901 it was 29.6; in 1911 the total population in one to four room tenements was 2,628,000, and the overcrowded figure was 726,000.

334. Mr. Lockett: The same as in 1901 roughly?—I am giving the round figures to the nearest thousand. The percentage is 27.6. In 1921 I gave the figure roundly as about 3,000,000; it is 2,914,000; and the number living in overcrowded conditions is 662,000, and the percentage there is 22.7.

335. Mr. Stafford Cripps: That is in London proper?—That is purely the London County area itself.

336. If I might just say the effect of those figures, this would be correct, would it not, that the total population in these small tenements has increased considerably?—Yes.

337. But the amount of overcrowding has decreased?—That is so.

338. The percentage of overcrowding has decreased?—That is so, and that is attributed to the improvement of transport facilities, and from time to time the efforts made to secure cheap fares on the railway.

339. Mr. Jepson: Would you not say that one element leading to this result has been the higher wages drawn by the workmen?—That would not have made itself felt in the figures for the census of 1921. The overcrowding condition in London at that time were worse than they have been in one way for a long time. If I may, I will deal with the wage question in a moment.

340. Mr. Stafford Cripps: Before we leave the question of your obligation as an authority to find housing, you have now got a large housing scheme on foot?—Yes. Public authorities in the past have probably only provided something like 5 per cent. of the houses occupied by persons of the working class, and that has only been relatively within quite recent years, and they have only one done that when private enterprise has failed to make the provision necessary to meet these overcrowded conditions in the big districts. It has not been a local government function to provide that housing accommodation for workmen, and in thinking of this, as I said when I started, it was not the Council's pure position as the owners of estates for housing that caused them to take an interest in cheap and efficient transport for the working class.

341. But, as a matter of fact, in connection actually with your own housing estates have you come across the difficulty of what I might call the excessive cost of transport to and from?—Oh yes. We have to go further and further afield for our big housing estates. It was possible to buy sites just on the border of the County; we have now to go much further afield for them. Probably the estate which is furthest from

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

the centre is the one to which reference was made by a number of the Tribunal yesterday down at Becontree beyond Barking. Others are under consideration which will be even further from the centre in other parts of London.

342. *President*: Approximately what distance is Becontree estate from the County Hall?—About 10 miles, I think.

343. *Mr. Stafford Cripps*: Is that from the County Hall or Liverpool Street?—I was thinking in terms of the termini, Liverpool Street.

344. It is 12 miles I understand from the County Hall?—Yes.

345. *Mr. Jepson*: Is that the same estate as I spoke of yesterday as near Dagenham?—Yes; you did refer to it yesterday, and I thought I would identify it in your mind.

346. When we had some evidence before us from the County Council on the Rates Advisory Committee a few years ago I think they described it then as the Dagenham Estate?—Well, it is, but it has been christened "Dagenham."

347. *Mr. Stafford Cripps*: I understand people did not like "Dagenham" so it was called "Becontree"?—There is a village of Dagenham which is outside the estate, and it is to avoid any possibility of confusion.

348. I think, as I said yesterday, as a matter of fact the workmen's fare there is more expensive than the second class season?—It is.

Mr. Jepson: One would like to see some details of that; probably you will put them in.

349. *Mr. Stafford Cripps*: The actual workmen's fare now charged to Liverpool Street, I understand, is 11½d.—This estate, if I may say so, is served by what I may call, three independent lines. There is the old Great Eastern with a station at Chadwell Heath and Goodmayes on the northern border of the estate; through the middle of it runs the Southern district line but with no station on the estate, Barking being the station on the west, and Dagenham station on the east. About a quarter of a mile from the southern boundary of the estate is the Grays and Tilbury branch as to which you had a case here a week or two ago which referred to Tilbury and Grays Thurrock. The nearest station there is Dagenham Docks station. On the Great Eastern line serving the north part of the estate the workmen's fare from Chadwell Heath station to Liverpool Street, or, stating it *vice versa*, before the war used to be 7½d.; it is now 11½d. To Fenchurch Street it was 7d.; it is now 11d.

350. *Mr. Jepson*: Fenchurch Street would be to Barking or Dagenham, I suppose?—No, to Chadwell Heath.

351. It is the difference between Fenchurch Street and Liverpool Street?—Yes. The equivalent value rate for a second class season ticket to Chadwell Heath, say from Chadwell Heath to Liverpool Street, is 10-68d.

352. *Mr. Stafford Cripps*: That is based on the annual rate?—Yes, that is 10½d.; and to Fenchurch Street it is 10-38d.; so that if the workman had the resources to buy a second class season ticket, and have all the facilities which a second class season ticket would give him, he could do it for less than the so-called workmen's fare which is now charged from Chadwell Heath.

353. *Mr. Bruce Thomas*: Would you give us the third class?—There is no third class season. The ordinary third class fare is 12d.

354. *President*: There would also come in, would there not, the question of the permanent employment of the workman. You put the inability simply on his want of resources, but it might be that he would not feel able, in regard to the job he had, to invest in a season ticket, because he might not be able to use it, if he was out of work, for instance?—There are times, of course, when unfortunately workmen are out of work, but the people living down here do come, as one might say, in 99 cases out of 100, regularly to London for their employment. I have 3,000 houses now under my management on

our Becontree estate apart from what I know is happening in the district in other houses.

355. *President*: We had an instance the other day of some 900 men going to Tilbury Docks who did not find employment; I suppose something of the same sort may happen with your workmen?—It might, yes.

356. I am giving full weight to your pecuniary reason, but I was thinking there might be additional reasons why the workmen would not invest in a season ticket?—One does know that the people who live in these smaller tenements are folk that have very little resources, and they do really live from week to week on their earnings.

357. *Mr. Jepson*: Would you say, taking the 3,000 houses down at Becontree, that the occupants are to any extent the sort of workmen that go down to the docks for casual labour?—No.

358. Would it be correct to say that they are the better class of workpeople, the artisan class?—That is so. Of course, workmen's trains have never been limited to the casual labourer only.

359. No; it was only just to know what sort of people you had in your houses; whether they were the sort of dock labourer type or the better class of workman?—You might have a few here and there, you know.

360. I suppose in the ordinary way the casual dock labourer could not afford to pay the rentals?—Oh no.

361. *Mr. Locket*: I think you mentioned the ordinary third class fare from Chadwell Heath just now?—12d.

362. *Mr. Stafford Cripps*: That is the single fare?—Yes.

363. *Mr. Locket*: As compared with 11½d. to Liverpool Street and 11d. to Fenchurch Street for the workmen?—The workmen's return.

364. *Mr. Jepson*: About how much on the average are the rentals of these houses; can you give us a general idea?—I am sorry I cannot charge my mind with it. I ought to know because they are all in my hands, but I do not profess to know them all. Some of the biggest houses run up probably to about £1 a week.

365. Including rates?—No, probably the biggest would be exclusive of rates. There is a great agitation for a reduction of rents there; I know that.

366. Are the rents that are charged and obtained by the London County Council economic rents?—I mean to say, do they cover the cost of buildings, fair interest on capital including depreciation and maintenance, and so on?—All the houses built in pre-war days do that and show a profit, but those built post-war, like all the post-war houses built under what one knows as the Addison scheme, show a heavy charge on public funds.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: And that would be rather an argument, would it not, if anything in favour possibly of the railway company helping to bear this heavy charge by reducing the workmen's fares?

Mr. Jepson: Is it?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I am only asking Mr. Hunt.

367. *Mr. Jepson*: I thought it was a comment of yours; I did not know you were putting it as a question to the Witness.—I rather put it as what apparently has been considered a normal function of a monopoly like a railway company to provide facilities for the workmen. Parliament has always considered that, and in times when they expressly directed their attention to it they have imposed quite serious obligations on the railway companies in that direction.

368. *Mr. Stafford Cripps*: Anyway, one may put it in this way, that from the point of view of housing, the railway companies are a very essential and important feature?—They are. All transport facilities, and railways for the longer distances are most essentially the important element.

369. And the question of how much they charge, and upon what system they charge, is a very essential consideration in the policy of housing?—It is.

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

370. With regard to the amount that is charged, that in effect comes to an addition to rent?—Yes.

371. It is hardly worth putting to you, I think, that if the house is a long way out and the uniform mileage rate is charged, it will mean a very heavy increase in the rent?—Oh, it will, and it will be treating the workmen really on lines which are very different from others who travel regularly from their place of residence to their place of work.

372. Have you a copy of the railway companies' schedule?—No, but I have it fairly well in mind.

373. That is the schedule as we have heard which was laid down by the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?—Without even the limitations which are suggested there.

374. Yes; without the limitations as to increase which were suggested. I want you, if you will, to say something of the general conditions which prevailed with regard to workmen in 1920, when this Rates Advisory Committee schedule was got out?—Probably the Tribunal will forgive me if I say that in 1920 there seems to have been a state of panic with regard to the deficit of the railways, because the proceedings before the Committee and the communications from the Minister of Transport also show that the height to which wages had risen had also created a state of panic in the minds of the Ministry of Transport and others, and rather lead one to think that the schedule which was then put forward was one based upon the special conditions of that time.

375. There is a passage here I will read to you, if I may, from the Report, which I think is what you mean to refer to. This is from the Report of the Rates Advisory Committee: "Since the original grant of these facilities"—that is to say, the workmen's fare facilities—"there has been a great change in the situation. Prior to 1914 the normal wage of unskilled labour was 20s. to 25s. a week, and that of skilled workmen was £2 to £2 10s. 0d., whereas now an unskilled labourer receives about £3 10s. 0d. as a minimum per week and the wages of the skilled labourer are correspondingly greater. The cost of operating the trains has in the meantime more than doubled."—That is one of the passages; there are numbers throughout the proceedings which indicate the same frame of mind.

376. With regard to that, you have got out a statement, I think, "F.H.2"?—I have.

(Document handed in.)

377. That gives the comparison between the percentage increase of wages in 1920 and 1923 over the pre-war rates?—Yes. You see about the end of 1920, which is just following the time when this particular scale received approval, the wages reached their maximum height according to the Ministry of Labour Gazette.

378. I think the summary of all these figures appears at the end of the second page. The estimated general average increase with regard to all industries and occupations in 1920 was 170 to 180 over pre-war rates?—It was.

379. And on the 31st March, 1923, it had gone down to 70?—We want to show there was a tremendous change in the relative conditions. Whatever might have been the conditions in 1920, they certainly do not obtain to-day, and there is every indication that there is a tendency downwards. Even the average does not quite give a full view. True, the engineering trades which are lower than the average, and the coal mining, do not perhaps interest London very much—engineering does on the riverside, but the big figures still maintain generally in the railway service which of course are included in the average here, but are never affected at all by the cost of travelling facilities.

380. They get free travel with privilege tickets?—They are on the job.

381. President: You are referring to the figures at the bottom of the first page?—Yes. They all have the tendency to keep up the average of the 70 per cent. which the totals show, at the same time not being affected at all by the cost of transport.

382. Mr. Stafford Cripps: For instance, if you take engineering and shipbuilding, which appears in the middle of the first page, all of those practically have dropped to somewhere between 20 per cent. and 50 per cent. increase above pre-war?—Yes; the labourers have dropped least there; those are the lowest paid people.

383. Mr. Jepson: There is not much shipbuilding in London now?—A fair amount up and down the river. I think there is a great deal; it is one of the biggest trades in London, but it is not concentrated as you find in other great cities.

384. Mr. Locket: It is ship repairing rather than shipbuilding?—Yes; it is all covered by the trade, you see.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: It is shipbuilding and engineering, you see, as well.

385. Mr. Jepson: Yes?—After all, London is the biggest port in the Kingdom still.

386. Yes, but not for shipbuilding?—There is a good bit of engineering work in it; it is not shipbuilding in the sense that you have it on the Tyne or the Clyde.

387. Mr. Stafford Cripps: On the question of the pre-war workmen's fares, you have got out a table, I think, "F.H.3," which gives an indication of the very low basis upon which what one might call the Parliamentary workmen's fares were fixed.—When Parliament has really dealt with this question of workmen's fares it has always imposed a very low figure, you might call it, as a proper charge to impose upon the railway companies for workmen's fares. I think I may say this is a fairly complete list.

(Document handed in.)

388. As regards London it is fairly complete?—Yes, a fairly complete list of those which have been imposed by statute specifically on the railways other than Tube railways. The Tube railways stood in a category by themselves, and that question will come up again for review in either 1925 or 1926.

389. As regards workmen's fares coming to London other than those shown on this sheet, those were fixed voluntarily by the railway companies?—Yes.

390. Mr. Jepson: This is a list of the so-called statutory workmen's fares as distinct from anything fixed under the Cheap Trains Act either voluntarily or by some authority?—It is where the statute imposed on the railways other than Tube Railways a special workmen's fare at a special rate. There are other provisions as to workmen's fares, but not where there has been a fare fixed by Parliament.

391. This is not comprehensive of all the statutory fixed charges for workmen's fares?—This is the London one.

392. I mean into and out of London?—Other than Tubes; I think that is right.

393. Of course, I am calling on my own experience now, but I have a recollection that when the electric line from Watford to London—that I was dealing with under the question of the Tube; that was an extension of the Tube railway.

394. I think this is right, and perhaps you might confirm me: I think then the London County Council wanted a rate of 2d. or 3d. to Watford and back, and the Parliamentary Committee, I think, put upon them 9d.?—I am not sure about what the figure was. I should hardly imagine we should ask for 2d. all the way to Watford.

395. Well, some low figure?—We asked for a special fare for workmen in that, and we got something.

396. It is left out of this because you consider the Watford electrification a Tube railway?—It is an extension of the Tube.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: It is being dealt with under the Tube system rather than under this system.

Mr. Jepson: I should not think so outside Queen's Park.

President: Is it in the provision that take it out of the jurisdiction?

Witness: May I look that up and make quite sure about it?

President: Yes, look it up and tell us later.

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I understand there is no special workmen's fare to Watford; it is only as far as Queen's Park.

Mr. Jepson: There is no special workmen's fare, but is it not the fact that Parliament fixed a workmen's fare between London and Watford in the Act?

397. Mr. Stafford Cripps: I understand not?—At any rate we will look that up.

398. Now with regard to the Rates Advisory Committee's scale, we have heard how that was applied, and you have prepared a table "F.H. 4," which I have already put in and explained to the Committee, which shows that as regards the London & South Western Railway, which you merely took as an example—I take it there is no special reason for taking it?—Waterloo was taken because of the simplification of one terminus there in London.

399. You did not take it because it was specially good or specially bad?—No, it was taken for simplicity, really avoiding other complications.

400. That shows in the last column but one that at the present time not a single what we might call an Advisory Committee scale rate is in force?—No. Of course, the comment is that the scale as now put forward, as one imagines it would be applied in money, seeing what its origin was, and also the stepping, would have given you a figure which is set out in the third column of figures. The actual fares that are charged were limited on the increases of the 1st September to the figures in the fourth column of figures by reason of the limitation imposed by the Ministry of Transport, realising that the stepping up would be so great and inflict such hardship that there was to be nothing more than 4d. a day increase.

401. I think this shows another thing which the Committee were anxious to have information about yesterday, which they commented was not in the picture which we showed them: it shows that the actual fares charged since the 1st January do in fact taper very much more than the Rates Advisory Committee's scale?—Yes. You find that in the last column of all the differences between the actual to-day and those of the scale gradually increase. There are one or two exceptions from the general, but they merely increase as the mileage increases; it is not regular.

402. Whereas in the first ten it is roughly an average of a 2d. increase, in the last ten it is roughly an average of 5d. or 6d. increase?—Yes.

403. Which means to say you are tapering to the extent of something like 4d.?—That is so.

404. I think that does give the information which was not on the map. Now with regard to the question of the proportionate increase which the Rates Advisory Committee's scale as applied has led to, I think you have also got out a table to show that, which is "F.H.5."—That is so.

(Document handed in.)

405. Perhaps you would just explain that to the Committee?—That was an endeavour to show that the increase in what one might call the travel rate, while it has been substantially the same with ordinary fares and season ticket rates, has been very, very much greater in the case of workmen's fares. You see 50 per cent. for ordinary fares and 50 per cent. for season ticket rates were recognised increases over this ruling.

406. And those have been applied?—Those have been generally applied. Then when you come to workmen's fares, the first part of the table on the second page of that exhibit is a combination of the particulars of various railways, which shows that on an average the pre-war mileage rate of workmen's fares was '28; in 1922 it was '55, and in 1923 it is '49; so that the increase in 1922 was nearly 100 per cent. as against 50 per cent., and in 1923 it was '77 per cent. as against 50 per cent.

407. Of course, those increases in the ordinary and season ticket rates were made on the actual?—Yes.

408. And the first column on the second page which gives 96 per cent. increase was, of course, what one

might call the first modified application of the Rates Advisory Committee's scale?—Yes.

409. No increase was to be greater than 4d. a day?—That is so.

410. The second column shows it with the second modification, that it was in no case to exceed the ordinary third class fare?—Yes. Then the second part of that table gives the same effect in another way. These are taken from the railway returns, and I suppose one may take them as being figures one can accept without any question. They are the difference between 1913 and 1921 for ordinary fares, which shows that the ratio of increase per passenger was 83 per cent., whereas the ratio of increase in so far as actual amount was 75 per cent. There always must be a difference between the two. You get the same sort of thing in the season ticket rates of 57 to 50 which so nearly accords to show what was happening there; but when you come to workmen's fares the ratio of increase per passenger was 113 per cent. which rather indicated again that the increase in the rate charged to them must have been about 100 per cent., or double the figure for the season ticket rates.

411. Those later figures are really only put in to confirm the general conclusion?—The general conclusion that the workmen's fares have been compared with what they were pre-war increased to a much larger extent than other passenger fares on the railways.

412. Now with regard to the comparison between workmen's fare and third-class seasons, you have got out a table "F.H. 6," and I think that table is what one might call the key to the picture which we have used.

(Document handed in.)

The diagram which you used yesterday was prepared really to illustrate this table. It is so much easier sometimes to visualise the effect on a graph than it is by a series of figures, and you have the advantage too that you can more easily draw a deduction from that and convert it into figures afterwards than you can try and do it direct by figures.

413. Will you just explain "F.H. 6," to the Tribunal?—The first two columns, the scale of season ticket rates, are the third class seasons. Those were figures which were given by the railway company on a previous hearing in connection with the question of the Schedule, and I have accepted them as being accurate for this purpose, and then converted that into the daily return fare, on the basis of 600 single journeys in a year. There is only one comment on that which was raised yesterday by the Tribunal, that in drawing the distinction between these and the workmen's figures the passenger has, in fact, paid for any travels he does on a Sunday, but for the purposes of this table and for the diagram, if you assume he was travelling more than 600 journeys a year these figures would have been all fractionally less; so it is quite true to say that anything above he does not pay for, and that makes a difference between the third class season and the workman.

414. Also there is another item which I think has not been mentioned to the Tribunal, and that is the fact that if a passenger pays in advance for a year's ticket the railway company have a very large sum of money which they can use in their business and get interest?—Yes. Of course in fairness they may say that is one reason why they have given the lower rate.

415. That is one thing which has to be taken into consideration?—Yes, quite. That shows in the last columns the fact that with the third class season ticket, the highest and the lowest (and that is exemplified in the diagram), both taper off according to the distance run, and the taper is curiously consistent whether you take the highest or the lowest, whereas the scale which we know as the Rates Advisory Committee's scale, and which it was admitted yesterday was the basis of the form of the Schedule

30 May, 1923.]

Mr. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

before the Court to-day, shows that it is practically after the first step of 4 miles a level one; there is no tapering at all.

416. I do not think it is necessary to ask you to compare the advantages between season ticket holders and others, because it is really a matter of argument. Do you agree with Mr. Cox that the workmen's fares, anyway for considerable distances from London, should be less than the third class season?—I am not a railway man but from a business point of view I should say there could be no question about that, and it is supported evidently by the views of the railway companies as evidenced by their practice in the past, and also by the evidence of their experts to-day.

417. Anyway, from a housing point of view that which we have described as tapering is important?—It is.

418. Now with regard to the proposals of the Council, as a matter of fact were those proposals put forward with a view to incorporating two principles?—Yes.

419. The first of those being what we have described as tapering?—Yes.

420. And the second, the interdependence between the workmen's tickets and the third class ordinary ticket?—Yes—the workmen's ticket and the actual ordinary fare.

421. As far as the Council are concerned, although we are not at the moment dealing with the question of season tickets, they would desire a similar interdependence between the season ticket rate and the third class ordinary fare?—Yes.

422. And that, in your view, there is room for in the form of the Schedule which the railway companies have put forward when we come to the question of quantum?—Yes.

423. Mr. Jepson: Mr. Hunt expressed the opinion in reply to something which you put to him just now that the workmen's fares for long distances should be less if anything than the third class season ticket rates, and it was said that he was supported by Mr. Cox in that. Would he give us his reasons why, assuming that workmen are earning as much as junior clerks or typists, or girl clerks in an office, they should have a lower charge for travel than these clerks and typists who are probably earning not more, and in many cases less, than the workmen?—As a matter of fact, the clerks and the typists do avail themselves of workmen's fares, and one of the great troubles in the past in the neighbourhood of Liverpool Street station has been that those whose work did not involve their attendance at the office until 9 o'clock came up and used to wait in the station and the cloak rooms at Liverpool

Street from the time of the arrival of their trains until they passed on to their offices. I think we have got to get right past the idea that there is any clear distinction between the black-coated workmen and the tustian workmen; they are all workpeople, and the term "workmen's tickets" now applies really to the hours within which you travel rather than the actual vocation you follow when you get to your place of occupation.

424. That is the distinction you draw as between workmen's tickets and third class season tickets?—Yes.

425. Generally, you would say third class season tickets use the trains after the hours during which the trains run for which workmen's tickets are available?—Generally speaking, that is so.

426. Mr. Stafford Cripps: And if I may put it to you, that was the basis before the Rates Advisory Committee of the railway companies' evidence as to the proper distribution of the traffic in the early morning hours?—I always understood so, yes.

427. Divided into these proper sections according to the charges?—You have a series of peak loads really. Some people are prepared to put up with the inconvenience of getting to their terminals not later than 8 o'clock, or, at any rate, just after 8 o'clock because of the cheaper fare; they are prepared to put up with the inconvenience of waiting about at this end before they get work.

428. If the workmen's fare is greater than the third class season, or the same, there would be nothing to induce people to travel earlier so as to get the distribution of traffic which the railway companies desire?—No.

429. Mr. Jepson: From your experience is there a large number of people who are not required to get to the offices in the City say till 9 o'clock in the morning who do leave by workmen's trains before 8?—Oh yes, 430. A very large number?—Quite a large number; it has been so in the past, particularly at Liverpool Street; and I believe the Clergy of the neighbourhood have been so troubled over it that they have opened their Churches as places of rest for those early morning travellers.

431. One has read of that in the newspapers?—That is the fact, Sir; it was not romance.

Mr. Jepson: Oh no, I do not say so.

432. Mr. Stafford Cripps: One of the advantages which the County Council consider would be achieved by relating the workmen's fare to the ordinary fare would be that any change in the ordinary fare would automatically be reflected in the workmen's fare?—Yes; administratively it is simpler.

Cross-examined by Mr. BRUCE THOMAS.

433. You realise that this Court has to fix a standard for workmen's fares?—Yes.

434. And the standard will be a fare above which no workmen's fare between given points of a certain distance will be able to be established?—That sounds very much like a maximum, but not necessarily a standard.

435. But is not that what the standard will be?—I do not know; that will be for the Tribunal presently; but I should not have considered that that would have been correctly called so much a standard as a maximum.

436. If this Court fixes a standard you realise that no workmen's fare will be able to be charged above the standard that is fixed?—Certainly; I understand that.

437. So that so long as the standard remains it will be the maximum, will it not?—It will, and therefore it is important that the standard should accord as closely as possible with the reasonable possibilities of the actual, so as to remove from the companies the temptation, we will say, to charge too high a workman's fare.

438. Of course, that is a question of the amount that is ultimately fixed in the schedule?—I quite agree.

439. We are not here to discuss that, but of course it is a little bit difficult to keep the two things entirely distinct. This would be a correct criticism, would it not, of most of these tables—or I will not say criticism, but a statement of the utility of them—that they mainly go to this point that the workmen's fare should be as low as it can be practically put?

—That is not the only point on them.

440. Is not that one of the principal points that is sought to be made by these tables?—These tables illustrate what in fact has been done in the past.

441. And goes mainly to the question of the amount of the charge?—Well, not only to the amount of the charge, but, if one might call it so, the scaling of the charge.

442. One table does, but I put it that they mainly go to the amount of the charge—I do not say entirely?—That may be the impression left on your mind; I thought they went further than that, and indicated, generally speaking, the scaling, and the fact that a scale in practical money, based upon your form of schedule, certainly would give you a rating for workmen's fares, which are higher than you think necessary to-day for a class of travel facilities which is much more valuable than that which is accorded to workmen.

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

443. Of course, I was not suggesting that they do not deal with that. The point I was putting, and what I was suggesting to you, was that what these tables mainly deal with—I do not say entirely—is the question of the amount of the charge; and they also, as one table shows, deal with the question of taper and so forth?—I will try and help you so that you do not have to ask me too many questions. It must be directed to that, because they are based on actual figures, and therefore to that extent you may say you are right that it is the amount that these tables chiefly deal with.

444. *President*: The materials by which you illustrate your principles are figures?—They must be figures.

President: And therefore, to that extent, they do deal with figures.

445. *Mr. Bruce Thomas*: The earlier point that I was attempting to make was that these tables really have not much relevance on the present inquiry; they may hereafter be important tables. When we are considering the form of the schedule and not the figures which are to be inserted in the schedule, these tables are not particularly important?—I rather thought that that was what you were getting towards, and that is what I wanted to protect myself from assenting to, when you put it to me in general terms.

446. The evidence that you gave and the statements you made with regard to your Becontree Estate, I think you said, referred to the excessive cost of railway transport, and you pointed out that the workmen's daily ticket was in excess of the second class season?—Yes.

447. It was purely a question of amount, was it not?—Well, it is amount, but it is an amount to indicate that you are charging for an inferior article more than you charge for a superior one; that is all. I can only illustrate that by giving you actual figures.

448. Is that correct, because it is much about the same, is it not, within a decimal point or quite a small fraction?—Well, you know the Great Eastern workmen's trains.

449. Well, the figures that you gave?—But if you will just allow me to answer, you know the Great Eastern workmen's trains, and you probably know their ordinary trains. One is the third class running into London before 8 o'clock in the morning, and the other is the second class season ticket. I suggest you have only to set those two things side by side to show that the quality of the article which the railway companies are selling to their consumers is very different in the two cases.

450. My friend put it to you that one is a 12-monthly ticket which is paid for in advance?—Well, not necessarily the whole 12 months.

451. I understood it was a 12-monthly ticket reduced to a daily basis.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Yes, that is so.

Mr. Jepson: But it is the fact that most of these 12-monthly tickets are payable in quarterly amounts.

452. *Mr. Stafford Cripps*: I believe it is a 12-monthly ticket paid for in three-monthly instalments?

—That is what I was going on.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Three-monthly instalments in advance.

453. In connection with another question put to you, that, of course, is a consideration, is it not?—Yes.

454. The result of that, as my friend put it to you, was that it gives the Company a considerable amount of money in hand?—Yes. We can easily value that in respect of every season ticket, and it will not make the difference, I think, between the 11d. and the 10-8d.

455. I do not say that factor alone will make the difference, but there are several factors, are there not, which tend in the same direction?—I do not know of any other one, but I know of others that operate the other way.

456. You think that to issue 300 tickets is not more expensive than to issue one season ticket?—Well, it depends entirely when these tickets are issued. I

know certain railway stations where the workpeople get their workmen's ticket for the next day on the evening when they return when the booking office is not very busy. If they all had to be issued in the morning when they are all running to the station—

457. I am afraid you have misunderstood me?—I do not think so; I think I know the point of your question—that it is easier to issue one season ticket four times a year on the quarterly instalments than it is to issue 300 workmen's tickets in the morning of the day on which the workmen are travelling.

458. That is part of it, and the other part is that in one instance you get one ticket, and in the other case you get 300 tickets, which may not sound much when we are dealing with one person, but it is a substantial thing, is it not?—It is. I know what it is, because I am concerned with a tramway undertaking, which is no mean undertaking, and I know exactly the measure of the trouble of the handling of tramway tickets.

459. *Mr. Jepson*: It is not only a question of handling; it is also a question of the cost of getting them?—It is the printing. I have been astonished at the small cost relatively to the total operation of the service.

460. *Mr. Bruce Thomas*: Now would you turn to your table "F.H.4" for a moment. In the fourth column you have got the Rates Advisory Committee's scale?—Yes.

461. And in your fifth column you have got that scale applied with the 200 per cent. and the 2s. a week limitation, I think?—Yes, practically the 4d. a day limitation.

462. Which is your green line?—My green line is the scale, because your Schedule has no limitation at all.

463. Your green line is the scale without any limitation?—Of course, I have got to deal with the form of your schedule, as one sees it.

464. I am talking now of this diagram, and what I wanted to know was this: is your green line here the third column of figures or the fourth column?—The third column.

465. So that it is not the actual maximum, is it?—It is the interpretation of the schedule.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I think there is a little misunderstanding. "F.H.6" is the one on which the diagram is based.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I know, but I could not follow it on "F.H.6."

Mr. Stafford Cripps: If you look at the sixth column you will see those are the figures actually plotted on to that diagram.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes, and what I wanted to know was, whether your sixth column in "F.H.6"—

Mr. Stafford Cripps: If you work it out you will see it must be obviously the Rates Advisory Committee's scale.

466. *Mr. Bruce Thomas*: What I want to know is, whether it is the scale without paying any regard to the limitation, or whether it is the scale having first applied the limitation?—No, it is the scale, and as I say I am trying to deal with the form of the schedule which you submitted here, which has no limitations, and which I have got to assume does not intend for this purpose—

467. Then I am afraid I entirely misunderstood this diagram. As I understood it, this diagram was prepared to show that up to 30 miles the workmen's ticket based on the Rates Advisory Committee's scale was at all distances above 10 miles, except for one very small point, higher than the highest season ticket rate reduced to a daily basis?—Yes.

468. That is what I understood was the purport of this table?—Yes.

469. What I am asking is this: in fact when you apply the 200 per cent. limitation, or what you call the 4d. a day limitation, to the workmen's scale you would bring that line lower down, would you not?—You would.

470. That is the first point?—But that is not the schedule.

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I think I can explain the difference between my learned friend and the witness.

President: Do you not think Mr. Bruce Thomas had better just get it right with Mr. Hunt?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Certainly.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: This gentleman is responsible for the plotting of these lines.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: No; I can call the gentleman who is if you want him.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I thought he produced this table.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Yes.

471. *President:* Another feature which Mr. Hunt has introduced into this is, that the green line has hitherto been called "The Rates Advisory Committee's scale"; now I understand him to say it represents the proposals deposited by the Company in their Schedule; is that right?—It is an interpretation of it based upon the knowledge that it is founded, as was said yesterday, and as one anticipated, on the Advisory Committee's scale of figures.

472. That does reproduce, as far as you are able to reproduce, the Schedule deposited by the Company?—Yes. You will see it, if I look at "F.H.6." You see there one mile worked out to 1-5d.

473. But is that so? Of course, I have heard Mr. Cripps' comment; he says "Do not regard it as a question of figuring at all, but look at it simply as an illustration of tapering"; I have got that into my head. Now you are being cross-examined upon this diagram and you are being asked by Mr. Bruce Thomas what it exactly represents?—Yes.

474. He put it to you that the green line was the Rates Advisory Committee's scale without the limitations; then in answer to that you said, I thought, "Yes, but it represents the Schedule now deposited by the railway companies" is that right?—Yes.

475. It is, in your opinion, the Schedule proposed?—I did not draw it myself as you know, Sir.

476. *Mr. Bruce Thomas:* No, but you prepared this table upon which it is based?—I prepared that table, yes.

477. *Mr. Jepson:* If one may add something to that, in preparing your diagram you have gone beyond the railway companies' proposals and you have incorporated, for the purpose of the diagram, the recommendation of the Rates Advisory Committee which was made for the purpose of an interim revision with a halfpenny for every half-mile over four miles, and you have continued your green line on that basis; but the proposals of the railway companies do not include anything of that kind, because they have left a blank for everything after four miles?—I know they have, but when you come to think of it in terms of actual coin, in grading this in thirds of a mile, you are driven to it that the minimum must be 1½d. a mile, or more, and I have taken the 1½d. as a practical thing.

478. *Mr. Locket:* That is up to four miles only?—Up to four miles, yes.

479. *Mr. Jepson:* As regards the tapering off after the four miles, what is the basis of your green scheme; it must be the Rates Advisory Committee's Report of a halfpenny a mile after the four miles?—That is so.

480. That is not the railway companies' proposal?—Well, we do not know what it is.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: May I interpose at this point, because I particularly asked Mr. Cox these questions as to what the intention of the railway companies was with regard to this Schedule, and, as you will remember, after considerable discussion with him I got him to say that the only figure which could be put in was the halfpenny for each half mile.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No, not the only figure.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: The only figure. He said "not conveniently" first of all, and I then got him to say it was not adaptable to any other figure.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: You misunderstood him, I am sure.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Well, I am quite certain I did not.

Mr. Locket: I did not understand Mr. Cox to say that. I understood him to agree that up to four miles it was the only figure; but beyond four miles I do not think was put to him.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Well, it will appear on the note; I thought certainly I put it to him.

President: Do you remember, Mr. Cripps, when you were cross-examining, and very properly cross-examining, to bring it to a crucial instance you said: "Take the distance between two and three miles, Mr. Cox"?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I quite agree, and there I went on to say: "It goes on for each additional half mile, or part thereof," and I said, "A halfpenny is the lowest you could apply to the half mile."

President: If you said it, you said it, and there is an end of it.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: And he assented.

President: That time will disclose. For the moment I take your word for it, of course.

481. *Mr. Bruce Thomas:* (To the Witness): In preparing this table you have had to assume that there are certain money charges, have you not?—Quite.

482. The green line, as you say, on this plan represents the Rates Advisory Committee's scale?—Yes.

483. It represents the money that appears in the Rates Advisory Committee's scale?—Yes, it is done to show that on such a scale—

484. Just excuse me one minute. The railway companies' proposals here are nothing more than proposals of form?—I agree.

485. There is nothing in them to indicate what their money proposals will be?—Again I agree, and that is just the difficulty in attempting to discuss form without money.

486. And that is what I am trying to bring out really—that the whole of your evidence is directed to money and not to form, or the greater part of it is?—Yes. If you can divide it up and put that little piece into a vacuum I will agree with you entirely, but you do want a Schedule which will permit of something which I venture to show on this diagram cannot operate at any rate in the most suitable form.

487. You want a Schedule which will not tie the hands of the Court when they ultimately come to settle the amount of the charge?—I agree. I do not want a form which will preclude the possibility of a taper.

488. Now will you for a moment glance with me at the proposals of the railway companies? There is nothing in that form to prevent any sort of taper that the Court might think desirable, is there?—I would suggest that there was.

489. If you were allowed to put any figures you thought fit in the last column, could you not put figures in which would soon make your Dagenham estate, as you attach so much importance to transport, a flourishing concern?—Please exclude Dagenham from it altogether.

490. Or any other housing estate?—No. I do want the Tribunal not to think of it in terms of the London County Council as owners of any particular estate.

491. May I put it in this way—

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Let him give his answer first.

492. *Mr. Bruce Thomas:* I thought he had finished. —From the point of view of housing the whole of Greater London is the area with which we are dealing.

493. Let me put it in this way—I will not mention Dagenham again if I can possibly help it—could you not put figures in that column which would enable you to shift all the population from the congested areas out into the rural districts?—Might I go with you up to the 4-mile limit? I agree with you I could put down figures which would give you a tapering figure, and a proper tapering figure up to 4 miles quite easily, but how, with all the ingenuity in the world, which I do not possess, I could in two blanks

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

provide for a taper for every half-mile from 4 miles up to 30, I do not know.

494. Your objection is that instead of two lines at the bottom the table should go on: "for each return journey where the single journey does not exceed," and then put 4, 6, 8, 10, and so forth?—I suggest that our form is a much simpler way of securing that end when this fails.

495. I ask you just for the moment to consider the railway companies' proposals. Would your point be met if, instead of the couple of lines of print at the end, you proceeded with the form of the table by putting in 4, 5, 5½, 6, 6½, 7, 7½, 8, and so on?—By such a process you could provide a form of schedule, but that, of course, is not your form of schedule here.

496. No, but I am just trying to find out in what respects this form of schedule would prevent whatever taper you might think desirable?—Well, I have told you that the form as it goes up to 4 miles would provide for taper, after that it does not, but if you alter it you could make it provide for a taper.

497. Merely by adding the different breaks 5, 6, 7, or whatever you dealt with?—It is only dealing with one part of the problem, of course.

498. What other part of the problem does it not deal with?—That would not necessarily relate this to the third class fare.

499. It would be open to the Court hereafter to put whatever figures they thought fit in the last column?—I agree.

500. It may have no relation at all to the ordinary fare?—True.

501. Why should the Court now tie its hands to fixing a standard fare which has a relation to the ordinary fare?—Because hitherto I thought it had always been the view of the prominent officers of the railway companies that all these fares should be related in some way or other to the ordinary third class fare.

502. I thought we had agreed that it was undesirable and not right to do anything now which would tie the hands of this Court when it comes to consider the question of the amount to be charged?—I do not know that I agreed with that.

503. Oh, you did not agree? I thought that was the first objection that you put to the railway companies' table—that it was tying the hands of the Court by precluding them from providing for a taper beyond the fourth mile?—I was objecting to the form of the Schedule preventing anything in the nature of a taper. Another scheme which would relate this to the ordinary third class fare would not necessarily tie the hands of the Court at all, because they would always have it in their power to vary the percentage which is an essential part of the form of Schedule suggested by the Council.

504. I suggest, of course, that it would, and that is the suggestion I was putting to you—that the Court ought to be left quite free to put whatever figure in that last column it may think fit having heard all the parties. Your proposal will tie their hands, because they will be compelled to relate it to the ordinary fare?—Of course, you will forgive me if I do not agree with you. The variable in the Council's form of Schedule is in the percentage, and the Court can quite as easily deal with the form of percentage of the ordinary third class fare as they can in determining a figure itself.

505. *Mr. Jepson:* Even to the extent in the first 4 miles, say of making it 25 per cent. over the ordinary single fare?—I presume the Court has full power to do anything it pleases within reason, and though I might disagree with the conclusion privately it would not be for me to criticise the decision of the Court here at any rate.

506. *Mr. Bruce Thomas:* Take now your proposals, will you?—I have not got the form here, but I have it in my mind.

507. "For each return journey where the single journey does not exceed," I am going to assume for the moment, "1 mile, so much per cent. of the ordinary third class fare"?—Yes.

508. What sort of zones have you got in your mind? I quite understand that the zone is only to regulate the percentage?—That is so.

509. What sort of zones have you in your mind?—You really want to get it into figures.

510. No. I want to see what objection there is to the form which you are proposing?—May I just illustrate it by this diagram?

511. I am rather bad at understanding those things, although they may seem very clear?—Of course, to some people's mind a diagram helps. Assume that the mean between your third class season ticket so reduced is a line somewhere down the middle which would give you a proper curve of tapering, and a position in value for the services given to the third class season ticket holders.

Mr. Locket: That is not an answer in any way to Mr. Bruce Thomas's question.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: It is not at all what I want.

512. *Mr. Locket:* Cannot you give us an answer direct? Do you mean zones, say, of 2 miles, zones of 5 miles, or zones of 10 miles?—It was not the zone system in that way. I was going on really—

Mr. Locket: You would get your case much better into our minds, I think, if you answered Counsel's questions and did not go on to some different line altogether.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: With great submission, he was just going to explain the zones; he was going to explain exactly how this was arrived at by the County Council which shows exactly what the zones are.

President: Mr. Cripps, you need not be anxious. Mr. Hunt is a very skilled and experienced witness, and he can take care of himself—at least I have always found him able to do so.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I did not wish the impression to be given that he was going off on to something immaterial.

513. *Mr. Bruce Thomas:* Try and put it in my way, because I want to understand this?—I am really trying, not only to help to inform you, but I want to carry the Court with me on this.

514. I am quite sure you are. Now just answer me this: we will assume for the moment that your scale goes down for each journey not exceeding 1 mile, 2 miles, 3 miles, 4 miles, 5 miles, and so on, right up to 12 miles; it will go further, but that will be far enough for this purpose?—If you will allow me to get a paper from my assistant I can give you an answer without even trying to show you on the diagram. (*Document handed to Witness.*)

515. Would you propose to have, first, a workman's fare for a distance of 1 mile?—It would depend. For the purpose of illustrating my own proposal—

516. But would you answer my question?—I do not assume that there would be any taper up, we will say, to 3 miles.

517. What I am asking you is this: in your proposal had you assumed that there would be a workman's fare for a distance of 1 mile only?—Well, I had not got down to settle exactly whether there was to a station within a mile of a terminus.

518. Where there would be a workman's ticket; there may be one or two of them?—There are a few now, but not many.

519. There are quite a number, I think, down in Essex?—There may be outside the London area. I am dealing here, of course, particularly with London.

520. Was it your idea that there should be a minimum distance?—No, it would depend upon the actual stations which would settle the issue of the tickets. 1 mile may mean nothing near a terminus. Of course, if you take the South Eastern Railway as being the example where all stations within 20 miles and all trains up to 8 o'clock must run workmen's fares, you may have no stations within a mile of the terminus, and I think generally speaking, that is the case, and the 1 mile will not come in.

521. Let us just talk in terms of a penny a mile for the moment?—Yes.

522. If you had workmen's fares in operation between two points a mile apart what would the

30 May, 1923.]

Mr. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

workmen's fare be if the Court ultimately come to a fixed penny under your Schedule?—I would say—call it an empirical scale if you like—that up to 3 miles you should pay about two-thirds of the ordinary third class single fare.

523. Let me just see that I understand that. The working out of your scheme would be that if the ordinary fare were a penny a mile a workman should pay for anything up to 3 miles two-thirds of the single fare for the return journey; that is the sort of thing you have in your mind?—That is one method of applying it. You asked me how it would be applied; I cannot now, of course, give you money values.

524. Oh no. Where you have a workmen's fare in operation for 1 mile only, then it would have to be, would it not, under your proposal, that he would pay the same as the third-class ordinary return fare?—Yes, because of the limitations of our coinage.

525. The answer is Yes?—It is the coinage; you do not split your pennies into thirds.

526. But surely you do not want to split your pennies into thirds there, because the ordinary is a penny a mile, and your minimum fare is two-thirds of 3d.; therefore the fare would be 2d., would it not?—You were asking me on the question of a mile.

527. I know?—At 3 miles, I agree; it is 2d. return.

528. Your proposal would be that the scale should run for anything up to 3 miles two-thirds of the ordinary single fare?—Yes.

529. At a penny a mile two-thirds of the ordinary single fare would be two pennies?

530. *Mr. Jepson:* That is for 3 miles?—That is for 3 miles, but you put to me the problem for 1 mile. 531. *Mr. Bruce Thomas:* I know; I am coming to that in one moment. Therefore, if you are going to travel 1 mile only, is not your scale providing for a 2d. fare for one mile?—No.

532. Well, what is it providing for?—I have told you—at least I thought I did—that there are very few stations within a mile of a terminus.

533. But let us assume that there are stations for the moment where the workmen travel only 1 mile of railway?—Then two-thirds of a penny return would practically mean that you would have to pay a penny return for your workmen's fare, because you have not got a coinage which will permit of your splitting your money up into thirds.

534. Then I did not understand at all what your proposal was. I understood that your proposal was, and I thought I had got it clear, first of all "for each return journey where a single journey does not exceed 3 miles"?—No; you asked me a question about it, and I was trying to show you my system would have applied in practice. I had taken for the first figure here 3 miles. You put to me a penny, and I told you frankly that on one application of it as a result of plotting and turning it back into figures was 66⅔, or two-thirds of the ordinary third class single fare for the return journey, but that I happened to have started at 3 miles, which was a practical distance. You put to me what would be the effect if there were a station at 1 mile, and I told you from the coinage point of view that you got a penny return for your workmen's fare on the supposition that you put to me.

535. How would you deal with the 1-mile or the 2-mile fare on the form as proposed by the County Council?—When you come to put in the percentage.

536. No; take the first column "For each return journey where the single fare does not exceed blank miles"?—Well, it depends; if it is 1 mile that you put in there, you have to settle what is the right percentage to put in to the second blank. You may call it 75 per cent., or you may call it 100 per cent.; it all turns upon what the figure is that you are taking as your basis.

537. Let us assume for a moment that you have got 1 mile there, and in your second column you have got 100 per cent.; against which mile would you make your first reduction in the 100 per cent?—

You want me to explain to you how I really got out this percentage? If it will help you at all, I can hand you *this*; this is the only copy I have got with me. (*Document handed to Counsel.*) You will see what the principle of it is.

538. I will look at that in a moment. I want you just to follow me in this. You take, first of all, 1 mile?—Yes.

539. And against your 1 mile you have got 100 per cent. of the ordinary fare?—Yes, assume you have 100 per cent.

540. It is in the second column, the percentage column, that you are going to have your zone alterations in the percentage?—Your taper, yes.

541. At what mile are you going to drop from your 100 per cent.?—It would probably be at the second mile; it would make a difference.

542. How would you drop; by what percentage?—I do not know.

543. You cannot have less than 1d. can you?—No.

544. And therefore you would have to drop, would you not, by a very large percentage?—Or not drop at all.

545. But you first told me that you proposed to drop. It would probably be necessary to drop at the second mile?—Yes.

546. Now I want to know this: if you have to drop you must drop by a big enough percentage to produce a reduction of a halfpenny?—I quite agree.

547. And what would that percentage be?—I do not know until I know what the figure is I have to deal with.

548. Let us assume for a moment that there is a penny in it?—But I cannot do that without working it out exactly on a curve. I have got a curve which I adopted for the purpose of this example—do not take it as an exact thing; it is an example—based upon the mean of your highest and lowest third class season tickets. I there assumed that the workmen's fares ought to be at a certain level below that; and then working back from the diagram I arrived at certain percentages which you have got on a piece of paper in front of you, and for practical purposes it may be that they will not work out exactly as a curve, because of the coinage limitations.

549. The point I am putting to you is this, that if you have 100 per cent. opposite your first mile and you are going to make a drop in your percentage at the second or even at the third mile, it must be a drop in the percentage which will produce some reduction in the money figure?—I quite agree.

550. And you cannot have a smaller reduction than a halfpenny?—Quite.

551. And that halfpenny on a penny fare would mean, when you have such an enormous amount of traffic passing at the shorter distances, a huge loss of revenue to the railway companies?—As a matter of fact, the stations within the mile or two miles are so small that it does not give you a big traffic.

552. But do you not see you start dropping at the second mile, and then you drop again I do not know where—possibly at the third, fourth or fifth mile?—This only shows once again that if you had allowed me to explain the way in which I had approached this by the diagram a lot of your difficulties would have disappeared. As a matter of fact you drop them as purely percentages arrived at from a plotting, and the effect of that would entirely depend on the ordinary fare to which you are applying them, and that would have to be modified to give you an actual fare having regard to the currency limitations. I agree you cannot have fractions of a penny or a halfpenny.

553. You know it is pretty certain that this Court will first have settled the passenger fares before it fixes the workmen's fares?—Of course, it would be an impertinence on my part to say which way the Court will deal with the thing, but I might assume that they would deal with them together.

554. Let us assume for a moment that they deal with them all together. Let us put it in this way: it will probably be known what the passenger fares are when the workmen's fares are fixed?—You do not

30 May, 1923.]

Mr. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

expect any answer from me on that; you would address, of course, that question to the Tribunal.

555. I was putting it to you that if I made that assumption I should probably be making a correct assumption?—You may, yes.

556. You would not like to commit yourself at all?—No, I do not think so.

Mr. Jepson: You only put it as high as this, I suppose, that probably the Tribunal, before they fix workmen's fares, will have fixed at any rate in their own minds or on paper, before they give it to the world perhaps, what the ordinary passenger fares will be.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: The passenger fare will probably have been discussed at least, though perhaps not published.

557. What I want to put to you is, do you not think it is much more convenient when you are fixing a standard scale that you should be able to look at the scale and see what the fare is without having to make any percentage calculation? If you could attain the various things that you want to attain by having a figure without a percentage, would you not think it preferable?—It depends. Who is it you are thinking it is convenient to. If it is to the workman, he does not care a brass farthing about the scales or standards; the only thing he is concerned about is, what is the actual fare. I looked at the station I came from this morning and there is a bill up in the booking office which says: "The workmen's fares from this station to other stations are so and so"; that is what the workman cares for. If you look at it from the practical point of view, it has no value to those who are going to take the workmen's tickets. I do not see that there is any great advantage to the experts in which form the standard appears, and a standard, I suggest, can take more than one form. The standard

here would be rather a percentage on a fare which may vary.

558. Your idea of a standard is a thing that slides up and down?—As a matter of fact, apparently that is the standard which is being fixed here, because apparently from all the evidence that was given yesterday, whatever you fix as the standard does not very much matter because you are going to do something entirely different which will then become the standard in practice.

559. I was not asking you what apparently other people's ideas of standards were; I put to you a perfectly plain question as to whether or not your idea of a standard was not one that moved up and down?—No.

560. Would you mind answering that question?—My idea of a standard is a scale, if you like, which is going to govern the fixing of the actual fares. A percentage here which we suggest should be taken as the standard will in fact settle the actual fares, having regard to what the actual third class fares are.

Mr. Jepson: Mr. Bruce Thomas, you did not deal with the question with a view of preserving revenue, because, after all, that is one of the important elements that the Court has to take into consideration. We heard the other day that the minimum charge for a workman was 3d.; that would be for one mile or two miles. I do not know, and I do not want to ask now what is in the railway companies' mind, but one would imagine if the railway companies are going to preserve revenue they have to start somewhere with that initial charge of 3d. To apply the London County Council's form to that, it would mean perhaps to start with 200 per cent. of the ordinary fare; I thought you said you were going to deal with that?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I am.

(The Tribunal conferred.)

President: Mr. Bruce Thomas, the Tribunal would like to know whether in the course of your cross-examination you suggested that the schedule which you had deposited might be so altered as to give more effect to the tapering principle that had been suggested by the London County Council.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: To leave it open that that principle if hereafter required to be given effect to might be able to operate?

President: That is it. Were you suggesting that your schedule could be so altered as to give effect to that principle?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes.

President: How are you proposing to give effect to that principle?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I propose it in this way, that we should delete "for each return journey where the single journey exceeds four miles (blank) for the four miles and (blank) for each additional half-mile or part thereof," and instead you would insert this: "for the next six miles," (I suggest), "or any part of such distance (blank) per mile."

Mr. Locket: You would say "(blank) per half-mile," would you not?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I was going to have a note at the bottom about the half-miles.

President: Would you just read your words again?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: "For the next six miles or any part of such distance (blank) per mile," and then "for the next ten," and then "for the remainder of the distance." Then I would suggest "Minimum charge as for one mile; fractions of half a mile and under to be charged as half a mile; fractions of over half a mile to be charged as one mile."

Mr. Jepson: "Fractions of half a mile as half a mile" would cover you, would it not?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes; that would cover both. Then it would stand as in the print: "Fractions of one halfpenny to be charged as one halfpenny"; that is what I had in mind.

President: I thought possibly something of that sort was passing through your mind, therefore I took

the occasion to ask you after consultation with my colleagues.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Mr. Jepson was asking me as to the question of the revenue.

Mr. Jepson: Yes. On the question of the preservation of revenue, which of course is one of the important elements that this Court has to take into consideration, one feared that if this scale of yours or the scale under the proposals of the County Council started with too low a figure or too low a percentage respectively, the railway companies might be losing a lot of revenue which they were getting from these short distance workmen's fares. I remember when we were dealing with the Grays Thurrock case the question of the minimum fare for workmen was treated as of very considerable importance, but no evidence was given to us that there was any large number of workmen travelling for one mile or two miles; we could not get any particulars; but it was stated in evidence that the minimum fare right throughout the country was 3d. probably for two miles. Therefore, when one came to look at this scale proposed, you would probably for two miles at any rate have to get in 3d. as your figure, which would be at the rate of 1½d. per mile, and even if you came to the London County Council's scheme, in order to preserve revenue, you would probably have to start with something like 200 per cent. of the ordinary fare.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I am much obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. Jepson: That is the point I wanted you to direct your attention to, to save this loss of revenue which seemed to be involved under either of the proposals before us.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I might possibly assist in clearing up this matter. The London County Council are quite willing that a minimum of so much should be put into the form of their schedule.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: It would not be on our proposal.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I thought that was meeting the suggestion which Mr. Jepson made.

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

Mr. Jepson: Yesterday, when you were addressing us, I said "Do you want to legislate for workmen for two miles and under," and you said "No."

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Practically, they do not travel those distances. We have no objection to putting in a minimum, and if that meets the railway companies I thought perhaps it would be possible to leave the minimum blank, and it would be more convenient to put in the exact amount when the amounts are being fixed—the minimum fare to be not less than so-and-so."

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I have now had an opportunity of looking at the document Mr. Hunt handed to me, which he says explains how he built up his table.

561. Mr. Jepson: Is this No. 6?—No. I thought Mr. Bruce Thomas must have misunderstood me. I said this was an example of a working of a percentage table—not how we built up the table, but an example of the working of it.

562. Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes; I put it quite wrongly. It is just an example that you have worked out of how the table would operate, taking a particular percentage with particular breaks?—That is so.

563. I should like just to get it before the Court. In this example you have started at three miles?—Yes.

564. You have filled in opposite it the percentage of 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent?—That is it.

565. So your proposal would be for a return journey not exceeding three miles that the fare should be 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of the ordinary third class single fare?—That is so. That was the case I gave you when you suggested putting in a 1d. a mile.

566. Let us assume a 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. fare for the moment?—Could you not keep to the 1d.?

567. No, because I have worked it out on 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. and I should have to work it out again if I took 1d. If you take the first mile and the ordinary fare is 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. and apply your 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percentage, you would get a workmen's fare of 1d.—Yes, that is if the 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. applied to one mile; in my table that applied to the third mile.

568. No.

569. Mr. Jepson: Is that so, according to your table? It says "For each return journey where the single journey does not exceed three miles."—I was thinking of it as a practical distance of three miles for the workmen's fare.

570. You mean a minimum charge as for three miles?—Mr. Bruce Thomas put to me the question of 1d. a mile a moment ago, and I gave 2d. workmen's fare up to three miles, which gives effect to what Mr. Cripps said was the minimum charge for a workmen's fare of 2d.

571. President: Mr. Jepson is merely on the language of your schedule, I think?—Please do not attach too much importance to the language as an inspiration. The idea there was for a distance of not exceeding three miles, that is, if a man travelled one mile.

572. Three miles or any part thereof?—Yes, if he only travelled one mile. Very few would do it, but if a man travelled two miles he would have to pay as a workmen's fare practically the equivalent of travelling up to three.

573. Mr. Jepson: The table does not state that. One would imagine from the reading of this that up to distances of three miles the man would pay as his workmen's fare 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of the ordinary third class fare. If the ordinary third class fare was 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a mile, two-thirds would be a penny for the first mile?—Yes.

574. It would be equally 2d. for the two miles?—Of course, you realise that this is not a scale we are putting forward in money just now. It was an attempt to show how a percentage would on our tapering operate for a series of miles. It was an endeavour to show the sort of percentages which would come at certain distances to give us anything in the nature of a figure of currency; that is all. I do not put it higher than that. It is not a scale; it is not an absolute application; it is simply an example as to how a taper dealt with in percentages

would operate at certain distances. I want to get that quite clear.

575. Quite. It removes the difficulty entirely if you say "a minimum charge as for three miles," because on the basis of the figures we have been talking about that would give the minimum charge for a workman for three miles as 3d., which is the present charge?—Yes. Of course, I realise that that is a very material point, and probably I may appear on it before you at a later stage, but this is merely an example of how a percentage taper could be applied according to distance and nothing more, and I do not want it to be taken to be anything more at this stage.

576. Mr. Bruce Thomas: Taking this percentage for the moment, that would, if applied, involve the railway companies in a very heavy loss of revenue?—I do not know, because I have not considered the figure yet; I do not think the time is ripe for that.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: May I now object at this period that this is purely going into figures. Mr. Hunt has not come here to criticise any railway company's figures, nor are these figures, as he has already stated, put forward as showing any quantum whatever; they are simply put forward as percentages. I do think it is both a waste of the Tribunal's time and not fair to Mr. Hunt now to start cross-examining him on quantum.

577. Mr. Jepson: There must have been some basis for these figures, if I may say so, and one wanted to know what the basis was, and whether this was a suggestion that had influenced the minds of the Council in preparing their diagram, because if it was not an instance of that kind you might put in any figures you liked, so long as they tapered, and they would be quite as useless or worthless?—May I say how those sort of percentage figures came to get on to a piece of paper as figures?

578. Yes?—It is what I wanted to explain to Mr. Bruce Thomas in the early stages. One had taken the mean between the highest and the lowest third class season tickets, being figures which the company themselves, as good business, are applying even in times as to-day. It was then assessed, rightly or wrongly. I do not want even to tell you the percentage, but a figure below that mean was plotted, and certain percentages on an ordinary third class return fare were deduced from that, taken of a scale, and you got at certain mileage distances and percentages in that way, and certain percentages are embodied in that table to show how a curve plotted could be converted into percentages, according to distance.

579. Do you mean the third class return fare or the third class season?—The third class season; I was dealing here with the third class season. That is the only way in which this percentage is in figures put down to show that it is possible to work it.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: With regard to the objection my friend took, it is absolutely necessary for us to understand what the position would be if the County Council proposal were adopted when we come to discuss the question of quantum.

President: You may say that it will involve a loss of a good deal of money, and Mr. Hunt says he cannot contradict that.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I wanted to show this, that if you have a percentage reduction you must at a very short mileage, that is when you get to somewhere about the seventh or eighth mile, get a reduction of something like 50 per cent.; in other words, at nine miles on Mr. Hunt's test of this table you would get a fare of one-half of the ordinary fare. At present the fare is roughly the ordinary single fare, and one knows (the evidence has been given here; they were the 1912 figures) that practically the greatest number of passengers travelling on the South Eastern at workmen's fare were between six and eight miles, so that in respect of the heaviest volume of traffic there is going to be a reduction from the present basis—

30 May, 1923.]

Mr. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

it does not matter what is the amount of it—of something like 50 per cent. That is the operation of this test that Mr. Hunt has given an illustration of, beginning with 66⅔ per cent.

Mr. *Stafford Cripps*: If I may say so, that is exactly the objection I take. Here is my friend now putting forward figures which Mr. Hunt used purely as empirical to show the sort of way you might graduate a percentage, and saying they are our proposals to reduce the fares 50 per cent. I think it is a great misfortune that these figures ever were put in; I did not put them in, and I have purposely not put them in, because directly you get these figures in you must get on to quantum. All they are is this: they simply show that you can write down a certain series of percentages. You might just as well say the figure for nine miles will be 100 per cent.; I do not know what the Tribunal will determine. It is a waste of time now to start arguing on the basis of 50 per cent.

Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: Did Mr. Hunt say that these were empirical figures?

Mr. *Stafford Cripps*: That is the very word he used—purely empirical figures.

Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: Are they?

President: Yes; Mr. Hunt says so.

580. Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: (To the Witness). On what experience are they based?—Once again I will try and explain to you that these figures of percentages were designed by taking a mean between the highest and the lowest of the whole of the third class season tickets in the Kingdom and assuming a value for a workman's ticket at some line below that.

Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: They are not empirical then.

581. Mr. *Jepson*: As I understood from Mr. Hunt in answer to my question, he said it was the basis of

his diagram?—Those are empirical figures, because the difference of figures is one which I have simply assumed, and to show that there was a way of plotting a curve and turning it into a percentage.

582. Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: Then it must mean a big reduction in revenue?—I do not agree that it must mean a reduction in revenue, even on the workmen's fares, which are in fact now being charged by the railway companies for the varying distances.

583. But surely if this calculation is worked out from a line which is below both those red lines, must it not mean a loss of revenue?—This diagram even now, I am afraid, has not yet been made clear to you or the Court. The red figures are the third class season tickets; the workmen's fares on your scale are above; in practice they are below.

584. Mr. *Jepson*: But it is the fact, as you put it to me just now, that you use that diagram as the basis for this percentage which you afterwards got out to show what would be the fair thing for workmen's fares, as compared with these red lines on the diagram?—It is my idea of a possible workmen's fare, but that I am not giving evidence on to-day. What is the right workmen's fare in relation to the third class season tickets I have not said a word about to-day, and I am not giving evidence to-day on that, because that will come on quantum. I am saying only that it is possible to prepare a schedule which has some relationship to a curve which is here; I go no further than that. I think I tried to make it clear before.

President: Yes, I think so. Do we want any more about it now?

Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: No, I do not think I do.

Re-examined by Mr. STAFFORD CRIPPS.

585. I do not think there is very much I need trouble you about. There was one little point you were asked about with regard to money paid in advance as to the season tickets?—Yes.

586. Of course, that is an advantage to the railway companies?—Yes.

587. And it is a disadvantage to the man who pays it?—Yes.

588. And so in effect it comes to this, that he pays more. The question of the divisions of mileage on the railway companies' proposals I want to deal with for one moment. The distances into which it has divided up the 3 miles are one-third?—Yes.

589. There is no unit of coinage used of the railway companies of less than a halfpenny?—No.

590. Therefore, there is no other rate which can be applied to 4 miles, using that full expansion of this scale, except 1½d. a mile?—The minimum of 1½d.

591. Supposing any other fraction were introduced than a halfpenny, or less than a halfpenny, what would be the effect, because you will see at the bottom that fractions of a halfpenny are to be charged as a halfpenny? I want you to take it for a moment that we put in one-third of a penny. One mile, we will assume, is a penny—I do not mean what we start with. 1½ miles would be 1½d.?—1½ miles would be 1½d. revenue, but practically it would be 1½d.

592. 1½ miles would be 1½d.—Again on the principle that the railway companies, both in distance and in rates, always get the advantage of the fraction, that will be 2d.

593. 2 miles would also be 2d.?—Yes.

594. So that you have a step put into the scale which is absolutely useless?—I gave the companies credit for not putting forward a scale which was not to mean something.

595. I just want to get the effect of it. You would have a step there over which there was no rise in rate?—That is so.

596. The effect would be that there would be a rise from 1 mile to 1½?—Yes.

597. Another rise from 1 to 1½, no rise to 2 miles, another rise to 2½, another rise to 2½, no rise to 3 miles, and so on?—That is so.

598. So that every third spacing you would get a distance of two-thirds of a mile before getting any

increase, and the way the scale would work would be you would get 1, 1½, 2, 2½, 3, 3½, 4, 4½, 5. Is there any possible basis upon which that can be reasonable?—I should imagine that this was not put in merely for the fun of printing lines, and that there was an intention in putting in figures which could have only meant practically a minimum of 1½d. a mile.

599. So that this form of Schedule, in your opinion, will bind the Tribunal when the time comes for fixing the amount to make it 1½d. a mile at least?—If they are to give effect to the form of the Schedule.

600. I am not certain now whether the railway companies are putting forward the Schedule as it is, or whether they have now incorporated the suggestions which Mr. *Bruce Thomas* put forward just now. I do not quite know on which basis to take it; I do not know whether Mr. *Bruce Thomas* can help me?

Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: It was a suggestion I made.

Mr. *Stafford Cripps*: I do not wish to waste the time of the Tribunal in arguing on one basis—

President: We must take it that that is a serious proposal of the railway company.

Mr. *Stafford Cripps*: It is their proposal now I may take it, and that they have scrapped the other one.

President: At all events that is their proposal now as modified by what Mr. *Bruce Thomas* said.

Mr. *Stafford Cripps*: If you please.

601. Their proposal now is, for the next 6 miles an increase of so much per mile; that would take you on to 10 miles, would it not?—Apparently, if that is the form in which Mr. *Bruce Thomas* intends it to run.

Mr. *Bruce Thomas*: You did not get the words right: "For the next 6 miles or any part of such distance."

602. Mr. *Stafford Cripps*: I do not quite understand the applicability of this, and perhaps you can explain it to me: "For the next six miles or any part of such distance, so much per mile"?—Yes.

603. That will mean that there will be a certain rate up to four miles?—It may be. Mr. *Bruce Thomas* put to me that it would be possible to have a diminished rate to effect a taper up to four miles, and for any distance beyond that, but the further form which I understand he has now put forward would have the possibility of a tapering up to four miles,

30 May, 1923.]

MR. FRANK WILLIAM HUNT.

[Continued.]

and then a flat rate for the next six miles, and then another flat rate for the next 10.

604. So that in fact instead of getting one step, as you do now, you would get two steps?—Yes.

605. One at 10 miles and one at 20 miles?—Yes.

606. The one at 20 miles for practical purposes not being of very much value?—No, and it does not give proper effect to the taper principle.

607. You said that with regard to the first four miles it would be possible to get a taper. I did not quite understand you.—Mr. Bruce Thomas put to me that instead of putting a fixed rate in there the Tribunal could put in any figure it liked opposite the various lines which appear in the Schedule which would give effect to a taper.

608. But they would have to be rates differing by a halfpenny or a penny?—I agree. I did not quite see how he was going to give proper effect to the taper, but it would have been practicable to have given some effect to a taper. On the coinage difficulty I am still unconvinced as to the possibility.

609. The coinage difficulty in fact defeats the possibility of a taper there?—Yes.

Mr. Jepson: But it would be so, would it not? I am only assuming figures, but supposing after hearing the arguments the Tribunal put in for the first mile 2d., 1½ 2d., 1¼ 2d., and 2 miles 2d., and then you began your taper at 1¼d. a mile.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: My point was if you are going to give effect to the divisions shown here, and I can only assume they are shown for the purpose of having effect given to them, you must add a halfpenny.

Mr. Jepson: But it does not bind the Tribunal as regards the quantum to be fixed against those fractions.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: No, it does not absolutely bind the Tribunal but the argument of the railway companies when they come before you on the question of quantum with that form of Schedule would be almost unanswerable.

President: Not after what has taken place this morning and yesterday.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: With great submission, they will be entitled to say this, and with considerable force, I submit: the Tribunal have accepted this form of Schedule which we put before them; the steps which the Tribunal have decided it is necessary to make in the workmen's fares are steps of one-third of a mile; we ask the Tribunal to utilise those steps which they have decided to be advisable and necessary,

(The Witness withdrew.)

Mr. Stafford Cripps: That is all my evidence. There are just a few matters which I said this morning I had not finished, and I want, if I may, to sum up the evidence in a few words.

The County Council in their case have emphasised, perhaps the Tribunal may think unduly emphasised, the question of housing, because they do feel that it is an extraordinarily important question, and a question of growing importance. As the Tribunal in their view are now settling for all time this question of the Schedule, they do very earnestly ask the Tribunal to take into consideration the great difficulties there are with housing, and by means of fixing a form of Schedule for the workmen's fares to make some real contribution, if I may put it in that way, towards the solution of the difficulty.

When I was addressing the Tribunal last night I think I might accurately say there were two difficulties in their minds with regard to the County Council scheme. The first was expressed, I think, both by Mr. Locket and Mr. Jepson: Why link up the workmen's fare with the ordinary third class fare? I went at some length into the reasons the railway companies had given with regard to the distribution of traffic, and so on, and I do not want to go into those again, but I do just want, if I may, to give three answers to the question: Why link up the workmen's fares with the ordinary fares? The first

and the only figures they can put in at each step as a minimum is one halfpenny; otherwise, the form of the Schedules the Tribunal have settled is valueless; it was not necessary to put in steps of one-third of a mile. That is an argument which the railway company would be perfectly entitled to use if they once got this form through, and that is what I am trying to guard against.

610. I think there was a little misunderstanding with regard to our form at one point; I do not know if it has been quite cleared up. In the last column you see the percentage of the ordinary third class fare between the same points?—Yes, I have not got it, but I remember the heading.

611. Whatever steps you put in, that is to say, whether you put in steps of 3 miles, or 6 miles, or 2 miles, whatever it may be, it would be a percentage of the actual fare between the actual points that the workman was travelling between?—Oh yes.

612. It would not be because it was a 6 miles step that every workman who travelled 5 miles paid a certain percentage of the 6 miles fare; he would pay between the same actual points. I think there was a little misunderstanding as regards that. Now as regards the question of the cost of the issue of tickets, which my friend Mr. Bruce Thomas made some point about, you were talking about the very small cost that you had found out of tramway tickets compared to the income?—Yes. Of course, it is an instance, but I have been surprised when I have been talking to the tramway management that the tickets themselves, the printing and the making of them, forms such a small proportion of the cost.

613. One thing is pointed out in this Schedule which I had not noticed before, and I am sure Mr. Bruce Thomas had not noticed, in the form in which it is. It is "Each journey where the single journey does not exceed." The 1-mile rate would equally apply to the 4-mile rate; the journey does not exceed 4 miles. It is not divided up into sections.

President: "Exceeds 1 mile, but does not exceed 1½ miles" you mean it ought to be?

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Yes, that is what I mean; it is no doubt a clerical error.

Mr. Jepson: The addition you made, Mr. Thomas, about fractions of half-a-mile being treated as half-a-mile, of course only applies to the new additions beyond the 4 miles.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Quite, yes.

answer, which I think before a Tribunal of any sort is a very powerful answer, is that all the parties before the Tribunal are agreed that it is the proper way of working the workmen's fares; that is unanimously agreed by all parties without opposition. That, I think, is a very powerful answer before any judicial Tribunal. Secondly, there are the grounds which I put forward yesterday with regard to the working of the trains into the big centres—and I do not want to go into that matter again, because I am sure the Tribunal have that in mind. That shows very clearly, and I think the railway companies' witnesses support that, that it is necessary for that purpose to have a linkage between the workmen's and the ordinary fare. It is no good having it between the workmen's and the standard fare, or a fare which is not actually charged; you have to have the two which are actually charged relating one to the other.

On the question which Mr. Locket put with regard to why I link it up with the third class season tickets, because that is what the diagram intends to show, that is what we should like to do, but, as a condition of that, the third class season must be linked up to the ordinary fare, and with that double linkage we should be perfectly satisfied to have the workmen's linked to the third class season provided the third class season was linked to the ordinary fare.

Mr. Locket: The reason I put the question was that, as far as I could see at that time, if they were

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

linked up solely to the ordinary fare you would not get the principle of tapering.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Well, the tapering percentage.

Mr. Locket: They you get a very complicated system of percentages.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I do not know that it is very complicated; I think it would not work out so in practice, but I do not want to go into that now. I do not think it would be any more complicated than working out the actual figures. If you wish to introduce tapering into the actual figures I think it would be just as difficult—more difficult, perhaps, than if you are going to work it out on percentages, because if you are going to work it out on actual figures you have to have regard to the coinage. With percentages if you work it out to the nearest halfpenny you get the value for every slight variation. If you have 60 per cent. of a 7d. fare, or whatever it is, it works out to the nearest halfpenny. It is perfectly simple to work it out; there is no difficulty in working it out.

I am not going again into the reasons for tapering, because I think it is more or less admitted now that this tapering principle is the right principle to adopt anyway as one of the principles. If we could get the third class season linked up to the ordinary fare so as to get that inter-relation which the railway companies require so urgently for the necessities of traffic we should be perfectly satisfied to link the workmen's up to the third class season.

The other difficulty, if I may put it in that way, which I think perhaps was in the minds of the Tribunal, was that this does not give a standard; the London County Council proposal is not a proposal for a standard rate at all. Of course, that must depend on the view that you take of the word "standard," and the plan of the Railways Act. I do not think there is any doubt that the utopia of the Railways Act is probably to have a more or less flat rate all over the country, but it is admitted by everybody that before that utopia can be reached, if it ever were reached, you have got to have a period during which there are a certain number of fares which are exceptional, which are not statutory. This Tribunal has stated that the reason for putting the workmen's fares into the Schedule is very largely in order that they may be in a position to ascertain as accurately as possible what the income of the railway companies is likely to be from that source—the workmen. From that point of view, if you link up the workmen's fares with the ordinary fares you will get a complete answer to your question now. You will be able to work out, once you know what your ordinary fares are likely to be, absolutely what your workmen's fares are, and it will be far easier if you have the standard, which in fact the railway companies can put into use, a real standard, and not a mere maximum which is not in the least what the Act designed to bring about. It was never intended under the Railways Act that this Tribunal should fix figures merely as maxima; it was intended that they should fix figures which could be used, and merely by fixing the figures which the railway companies themselves say will not be used in a very large number of cases, the Tribunal, I submit with great respect, will not be tackling the difficulty at all; they will simply be letting pass the opportunity, and a great opportunity, of putting the workmen's fares on a sound principle which everybody can understand, which will satisfy the workmen because they will see that it is reasonable, and see that it is fair, and that it has got some sense about it. If that opportunity is lost now, it means that the whole of this workmen's fare question is in future not going to be standardised; a maximum is going to be brought in by this Tribunal, and the railway companies are going on higgledy-piggledy as they have been for years, with a cheap rate here, and a more expensive one here, and so on; you are going to get your housing question all round London into an absolute state of chaos, and the railway companies themselves will

suffer considerably, because they will not get a fair charge for workmen, because they have to preserve these exceptionally cheap fares in exceptionally cheap districts.

That is my idea of the principle of what is meant by a standard rate under the Act, and I think perhaps the answer to Mr. Jepson's question as to whether you could possibly call this a standard rate is to say that where you get, for instance, a standardisation of wages on a sliding scale, it is a standard. You can have a standardisation of wages fixed at such and such a percentage on the cost of living. The cost of living moves up and down; so do the wages; but they are standardised absolutely. In the same way here you can have a standard workmen's ticket which moves up and down always in the same relationship to the ordinary fare. I submit that not only is that the far most convenient method of doing it, but by all the practice and desires of the railway companies it shows that they unanimously desire that there should be a definite relationship between the two, and that they do acknowledge that that is a very fair way of having a standard; in fact, Mr. Cox, when he was in the box, stated that as a matter of fact they would, I am not certain whether he said "rather" or "just as soon" have the ordinary third class single fare as the workmen's fare; it is the definite relationship between the two absolutely; it is taking the ordinary fare. That is, of course, what they pressed very strongly for before the Rates Advisory Committee, and Mr. Cox quite naturally said they had not given up that view, and they still thought that that was a very sensible and proper way of relating it. We are asking for just the same thing, only we want as well introduced this principle of tapering, and the only way to do that satisfactorily is to relate it definitely to the third class single fare, and put in a tapering percentage between the two. If you do that you get all the principles which the railway company admit are advisable to be carried out, and the principles of the County Council which are advisable, and as the Chairman said yesterday, we shall all be happy, when someone gave an answer to a question of mine.

There are two small points which have really been dealt with very fully. The first is weekly tickets, and the second is the question of luggage.

In regard to weekly tickets, I am quite prepared, if it will meet my friend's views, to leave out the number at this stage and say: "Weekly tickets shall be issued at the price of (blank)." It may be that the Tribunal will put in 6d.; it may be that they will put in 5½d.—I do not know, but I say that is a very reasonable thing to leave over to when the rates are being considered, because it is really a question of part of the rates. If you are going to issue a weekly ticket at five days it does make a reduction on the sum. It is in your minds, an no doubt was in Mr. Jepson's mind when he heard the evidence before the Rates Advisory Committee, when evidence was given that it had been customary amongst several of the railway companies and in fact two or three schedules of rates, I think, were put in, all of which showed the issue of weekly tickets at five times the daily, for instance, the Great Western and the London & North Western round Birmingham and Manchester. It is a practice that has been carried out on some railways, and surely they will wish that standardised. The question of how many it should be standardised at would, I think, be very properly left over.

Mr. Jepson: Apart from the question whether it is five, six or any other figure, according to your proposals, if that were put into operation there would be an obligation on the railway company to issue weekly tickets.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Yes.

Mr. Jepson: At the present time, it is within their own discretion.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: We should ask that a practice which is carried on in some railways should be standardised.

[30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

Mr. Jepson: The railway companies are not proposing to ask for any obligation to be put upon them to issue weekly tickets at all.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: No.

Mr. Jepson: We heard yesterday from Mr. Cox that no weekly tickets were issued on the South Eastern & Chatham Railway.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I think it would be correct to say that none are issued now, but I think they were issued pre-war.

Mr. Jepson: Mr. Cox said yesterday that none were issued on the South Eastern & Chatham Railway, and I understood that they never had been; it was in connection with what Alderman Dew stated.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: When I said they are exceptional, what I was referring to was the issuing of a weekly ticket at the price of five daily tickets; that is very exceptional.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: The other is fairly common at six.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes, I believe so; there are quite a lot.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: There are quite a lot of those, and I do not think the railway companies would probably much object if it was standardised, if we are not upon the question of how many it was to be standardised at until the quantum is being fixed.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: If six is inserted instead of five, we should have no objection.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: No. I said: "If we leave open the question of the number that is to be inserted until the quantum is being fixed." However, that is not a matter that I press with the same vigour that I have pressed the principles which we are asking for in the Schedule.

I am not going to say anything more about the question of luggage, because Alderman Dew has dealt

with that very fully. All I can say is that it seems to me that it is a very small matter. Apparently the railway companies have the opportunity of giving a very big satisfaction at a very small cost, and perhaps it would be well for them to accept it.

I only want to say in addition this: that if the Tribunal think themselves unable to accept the County Council's scheme as it is put forward, I do ask them to adopt some alternative scheme at this point, which does incorporate or allow the incorporation of the two principles for which the County Council are pressing, that is the principle of tapering and the principle of the inter-dependence of the workmen's ticket and the ordinary third class fare. We consider those two very vital principles, and this seems to us to be a great opportunity when those two principles may be adopted, and if this opportunity is lost, once the form of schedule is settled without allowing for those two principles, we feel that it may be many years before we have this opportunity again of helping the housing question of London.

Mr. Morrison: I have handed in a note that I am asking your consent to my saying a few words.

President: We are interested in everything you have to say; would you like to speak at length after lunch or could you do it in five or ten minutes?

Mr. Morrison: I shall be quite short. I am Secretary to the London Labour Party, and I only wish to say that the London Labour Party would desire that the Schedule should be in such a form as would not defeat the discretion of the Tribunal in considering the proposals as to quantum, which the Party will submit on behalf of London at the proper time. In this connection, therefore, I desire to associate the Party with the London County Council's opposition to the companies' proposed form.

President: Thank you, Mr. Morrison.

(Adjourned for a short time.)

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I propose to deal quite shortly with some of the arguments that my learned friend has pressed. The matter has now been discussed pretty fully before the Court since yesterday morning, but there are one or two considerations that I should like to draw attention to. My friend stated in his opening that the man outside London ought to pay the same as the man outside Birmingham. It is quite clear upon his proposals, if what he calls the standard is in fact in operation both in London and in Birmingham and not exceptions from it, the man outside Birmingham would not necessarily pay the same as the man outside London. It may be, and it is, I believe, the fact, that you more often find in London that the ordinary fare is something less than the old Parliamentary, and I suppose there is some reason to believe that it may in future be something less than the new standard. That is much more common in and about London than elsewhere. Therefore, upon my friend's proposal, which of course is put forward with reference mainly to London, the man outside Birmingham would not be paying the same as the man outside London. I submit that the idea of a standard charge fixed under the Railways Act is that it should be universal—that the standard should be the same all over the country, not that the standard for three miles all round Birmingham or any other part of the country should be different from a journey of a similar length round about London. Therefore, upon that, my friend's proposal is not giving effect to what he stated to be desirable, namely, that the man outside London should pay less outside London. In theory, there is much to be said for a scale of universal application. One knows that throughout the considerable inquiry that resulted in the Railways Act that was one of the matters that was most completely debated, namely the possibility of having a universal scale, but it was realised, and the Rates Advisory Committee reported, that it was impracticable. It was agreed it was desirable to reach such uniformity as was possible, but it was well realised and the evi-

dence showed that it was quite impossible either with the carriage of goods or passengers or any railway charges in fact to have uniform charges everywhere. But it certainly was contemplated that the standard charges should be uniform. It was confidently hoped that they would be uniform throughout a particular Group. It was hoped that they would be uniform throughout all the Groups. Whether that hope will be realised in respect of all traffic one does not know, but this Schedule is put forward on behalf of all the Groups and therefore in this respect the proposal of the Groups is that there should be a uniform standard scale in respect of workmen's fares thereby reaching what the Rates Advisory Committee thought was a desirable state of affairs so far as the standard is concerned. But it is not practicable to have a scale which can be applied universally. To-day workmen's fares vary considerably. They do not vary quite as much as they used to, but still to-day there is a very considerable variation to be found in workmen's fares, not only in different parts of the country but also between different points within a particular district. If you are going to have a uniform scale brought into operation and uniform fares charged, you have to strike a mean at some line between the highest and lowest fare. The result of that would be that those people who are now above that line would be very pleased to come on to the line, but those people who are below the line would have to go up to the line. That, in our view, would create very great dissatisfaction and would create numerous hardships. In our view, it is not practicable to obtain uniformity in that way, by striking a mean. Another way in which you could get uniformity is by bringing into force a scale which is based on the lowest level. That would mean, of course, a very great loss of revenue to the Railway Companies, and that loss of revenue would have to be met by the other users of the Railway. For that reason, I submit that that method of obtaining uniformity would be impracticable. The objections that exist to obtaining uniformity in that way in our

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

submission exist just as strongly in the proposal that is put forward by the London County Council. First of all, I think this would be admitted—I think my friend Mr. Cripps put it in his opening statement—that the idea is that all classes of traffic should contribute to the standard revenue in more or less the proportions in which they contribute to it now.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I did not suggest any such thing. That was the 1913 standard.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Very well: I submit that is a fair assumption to make, that the different classes of traffic should contribute to the standard revenue more or less in the same proportions that they contribute to it now. In order to obtain the existing proportion of revenue from workmen's fares, if one adopted my friend's proposals, you would have to start the shorter distances, 1, 2, 3 and 4 miles, at a much heavier charge than is paid today, in order to make up for the loss of revenue that would accrue if you adopted the taper which is brought about by the reduction in the percentages as proposed by the London County Council.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: I do not want to interrupt again, but we do not propose any figure. We propose it only as a principle.

President: I think Mr. Thomas is entitled to give his idea of how the principle would work.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: He said "the figures proposed by the London County Council," but there are none.

President: I know.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: There are no figures, but what is proposed by the County Council is as stated in the note. Perhaps I was inaccurate in referring to figures, but the proposal to be found in the note is "The form of the Schedule to be prescribed on the basis that the mileage be divided into zones"—that has now been explained—"and that the percentages of the ordinary third-class fare decreased with increase of mileage." This point I am making upon that is this. If you adopt that principle and you are going to have a decrease in percentage that must at the later stages involve the Companies in a very considerable loss of revenue unless the initial figure, that is the percentage that you put opposite the first mile, is a percentage which will produce something very much more than it produces to-day. That, I submit, would be found absolutely essential if the proposals of the County Council were adopted. Mr. Hunt gave some figures—it was only just an illustration—but those show, when you get down to about 7 or 8 miles, if you applied that principle to the fares as they exist to-day, where the fare to-day is somewhere about 10d. on adopting these particular percentages, the fare that would be payable under his proposal would be about 6d. Therefore, I submit, it is clear that you would have for the shorter distances to charge very much more than you are charging to-day. That, we submit, would not be right. It would certainly cause very great dissatisfaction, because we know that by far the greater number of workmen travel comparatively short distances. All those persons travelling these short distances would be hit by paying a higher fare relatively than they are paying to-day. If you do not do that, that is if you do not charge the shorter distances at a substantially higher figure proportionately than to-day, there would be a loss of revenue. I do not think that could be controverted.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: That is controverted because there is no evidence at all about it.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I think anybody can construct a table and can see for themselves that what I am stating is substantially accurate. The longer distance fares would be considerably lower than they are relatively to-day, and, therefore, unless you are to avoid a loss of revenue, those fares at the shorter distances must be increased.

Mr. Jepson: Unless you are to incur a loss of revenue?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Jepson: You said to avoid a loss of revenue.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: If you are not to put that increased burden on the shorter distances it must, I submit, involve the companies in a loss of revenue. If that is not to be done, then that loss of revenue has to be made up elsewhere—from the other users of the railway. Therefore, I submit, there are the same objections, and they are just as strong, to attempt to obtain this sort of uniformity that is referred to by the County Council by adopting their proposals, as there would be in trying to obtain uniformity by striking a mean, because there you get dissatisfaction from those persons who are brought up to the line and if you take the lowest fare you involve the companies in a loss of revenue which under section 58 would have to be made up from the other users of the railways. On those grounds, I submit that the County Council's proposals are not practicable and that they would work out unfairly to certain users of the railway as against others.

On the ground of simplicity also I submit that the railway companies' proposals are much to be preferred to the County Council ones. You would have no calculation to make; you would have none of these complicated percentages. They may not seem complicated to some people, but the idea, I submit of a standard scale is that it should show on the face of it what the standard is, and the proposals of the County Council, if adopted, would not show on the face of the schedules what the fare for the particular distance was.

There is really only one other matter which I wish to submit to the Tribunal, and that is on the Act itself. Section 30 provides for the submission of a schedule of the standard charges proposed to be made. Then it goes on in section 31 to provide for the settlement of that schedule of standard charges by this Court. Then section 32 says: "On and from the appointed day the charges appearing in the Schedule of Charges as fixed by the Tribunal for each Amalgamated Company in this part of the Act referred to as the standard charges shall be the charges that that company shall be entitled to make for all services rendered in respect of which charges are fixed, and no variation, either upwards or downwards, shall be made from such authorised charges unless by way of exceptional rate or exceptional fare continued or granted under the provisions of this Act." I submit that the intention and meaning of the Railways Act when it refers to these standard charges is that they should be settled at a fixed figure—at a figure to be fixed by this Court. That would not be so if the London County Council proposals were accepted. This Court will fix the standard passenger fare at a figure of so much per mile. The railway companies, under section 41, will be able to charge fares lower than those standard fares, subject to the duty of reporting them to the Minister, and to the Minister not considering that they are granting them to such an extent as will throw an undue burden on other users of the railway. They can therefore reduce those standard rates. Then those reduced rates will be what my friend calls the ordinary rates. His proposal is that this Court should fix the standard by reference to those rates—the rates that might be in operation from time to time. Under the Railways Act if the standard rate for a third-class passenger is fixed at 1d. per mile the railway company can reduce it to 3d. per mile, subject to reporting to the Minister. Having reduced it to 3d. per mile they can afterwards withdraw that exceptional fare and bring another into operation of 3d. a mile or go back to the standard of 1d. If the proposals of the London County Council are adopted this will be the sort of standard that this Court would have fixed. It will be a standard that can be raised or lowered at the will of the railway companies, subject always to being within the particular percentage of the standard rate for ordinary passengers. So that if you find in the London County Council schedule at a certain distance that the standard rate for workmen is to be 75 per cent. of the ordinary fare, the standard

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

when the ordinary fare is at the standard will be 75 per cent. of 1d. I am saying 1d. for the sake of simplicity. If the railway company a week after dropped that 1d. fare to ½d. then the standard will be 75 per cent. of ½d. That is the maximum for the time being, but the railway company can raise that fare 1½d. and then it is going to be 75 per cent. of 1½d. I submit that it is not right and not contemplated by the Railways Act, and that it is not desirable that a standard should be fixed which is a slide. It can be moved either up or down by the companies themselves. Therefore, my submission is that the proposals of the railway companies should be adopted. When finally settled and the figures are filled in, there will be a definite figure filled in, and there will be no possibility of moving that figure either upwards or downwards except by an application to this Court under the provisions of this Act to alter the standard charges. I submit that that is a grave objection, and I go so far as to submit that it is contrary to the provisions of the Railway Act that such a standard should be fixed. I agree that there is nothing in the Railways Act which says that a standard charge shall be fixed at a particular figure, and not fixed so that it can be moved up and down, but it certainly is, in my submission, not within the contemplation of the Act that it should be possible that a standard which, after all, is going to be the future maximum, could be moved either upwards or downwards by anybody except this Court. One other objection to the proposals of the London County Council, in our submission, is this. There is no reason why the railway companies, if they think that they can carry more traffic by giving reduced fares, should not reduce fares in order to meet competition. It is quite conceivable, and not only conceivable, but it is the fact, I believe, that you may have competition which affects the ordinary passenger traffic on a railway, but does not affect the workmen's traffic on the railway. Large numbers of workmen go to their work at an early hour. It may be that there is no competition then. The only duty upon anyone is to see that the worker gets a fair fare, one that he is able to bear, and one that is not an undue burden upon him. But there is no reason, once you have established the fact that the workman is being charged a proper fare, why he should get a lower fare because somebody else, owing to circumstances that particularly affect that other person, gets a lower fare

(The Tribunal conferred).

JUDGMENT.

President: The Tribunal propose to give Judgment upon this point of workmen's fares before proceeding to the other matters that are in due course to come before us, namely, season tickets, and traders' tickets.

We have listened to the arguments put before us, with great attention, and I have had the advantage of consulting from time to time with my colleagues. We are quite alive to the fact that no standard figures as laid down can meet all the numerous cases that the Railway Companies have to deal with. At the present time, they are met with a variety of charges in a great number of districts, and they are trying no doubt as far as they can to introduce the practice provided for by the Railways Act of 1921, with as little disturbance to the trade of the country as possible; and that will render it necessary for them to deal, no doubt to a certain extent tenderly, with exceptions to the standard which exists, although ultimately they may have the idea of bringing them all within the standard at some future time. But those difficulties as to the application of a standard seem to us to exist really whether you adopt the proposals put forward by the Railway Companies, or whether you adopt the proposals put forward by the London County Council. Neither of the standards pronounced can possibly meet all the variety of cases that are in existence; but

than he would get if those particular circumstances do not exist. If I find that there is keen competition, buses and other methods of transport, with the railways between the hours of 8 and 10, or 9 and 10, it is to everybody's interest that the railway company should reduce its fares in order to get its fair share of that traffic. Now, the London County Council's proposal would have this effect. If the railway company find it necessary to reduce their ordinary fare in order to preserve their ordinary traffic, they must reduce the workman's fare although the workman's fare is at a proper level. I submit that is a strong objection to the County Council's proposals. I ask the Court to adopt the proposals that have been put forward by the railway companies. As I said before, and as I repeat now, we do not wish to do anything to tie the hands of the Tribunal when they come finally to determine the figures that are to be put in this schedule. If the Court felt there was anything in the objection that my friend raises that, upon the proposals of the railway company, the Tribunal would be hampered, if they hereafter come to the conclusion that there should be a taper, then I make the suggestion which I have made. But I say this in reply to what my friend urges, that because you find in the railway companies' proposals 1 mile and 1½ miles, and 1½ miles, he hereafter will be able to say: "Well, the figure opposite the 1½ miles must be the same as the figure opposite the mile." There is nothing to prevent him saying that at all. This Court is not now deciding anything with regard to the figures that will go in. Similarly, hereafter he must be able to say that, for the next 6 miles, and for the next 10 miles, the same figures must go in. I do not admit the principle of a taper as contended for by my friend. That is a matter that will arise when the charge is settled. It is not our desire that the schedule should be settled in such a form as to make it impossible for the Tribunal to give a taper if they think a taper ought to be given. On the other hand, I want to make it clear now, that in assenting to the schedule going in in such a form as to make a taper possible, I am not accepting the proposition that a taper ought to be made. I do not think I can say anything more than I feel would be of assistance to the Tribunal, and my submission is that the railway companies' proposals as they now stand should be adopted.

President: Are there any other gentlemen who wish to address the Tribunal on this point?

it does not seem to us that one is more likely to cover more ground than the other in absorbing these exceptional cases. Therefore, neither of the proposals from that point of view is the more attractive to the Tribunal than the other. We feel that these exceptions exist, and they will not be put an end to in any measurable proportion, if I may say so, by one scheme more than by the other. But we have had certain considerations impressed upon us, and the consideration which has been most impressed upon us by the principal opponent to the proposals is this—I will not say "opponent" because I do not like to think that anybody here is an opponent to anybody else, as we are all here for the purpose of mutual discussion, and for the purpose of seeing what best can be done—but the main opposition, if I may so call it in that modified sense, comes principally from the London County Council, and the reasons for the opposition, in that modified sense, are these. They find themselves confronted with what undoubtedly is a very difficult problem, the housing of the working classes. They say that transport ought to make a contribution towards that difficulty at all events in the shape of giving facilities for them to overcome the difficulty in which they find themselves of having to go further afield when they wish to house the residents who are moving out of London. To a certain extent, and only to a certain extent, because what we do to-day does

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

not determine what we do in any sense in future under the form, we have listened to that argument, and we are attracted by the argument, and we think it is possible that in the future the Railway Companies, when they come to see the condition of things may consider it, and we, when we come to see the condition of things, may find it advisable to try and get the Railway Companies to consider it, and to ask the Railway Companies, or, if they do not respond to the invitation, compel the Railway Companies, to make some such contribution, and we should not like to put a form before us which would preclude our doing that. But we do not say that we shall do it. We want to give effect to what may be a pressing need, as the London County Council point out, of getting better terms for people when they go further off. Therefore, in that sense, we accept what Mr. Bruce Thomas has put before us; and we say that with regard to the rates, we shall propose to add in any case at the proper part of the schedule: "For each return journey where the single journey exceeds 4 miles, for the first 4 miles" and "for each additional $\frac{1}{2}$ mile or part thereof" we shall be in "for the next $\frac{1}{2}$ mile or any part of that distance per mile," for the next $\frac{1}{2}$ mile or any part of that distance per mile, etc., etc., and for the remainder of the distance per mile." We are very anxious to meet the opponents of the measure and to provide a form which we may be able to take advantage of, and which Mr. Bruce Thomas on behalf of the Railway Companies may be able to take advantage of. We shall have the advantage of hearing your arguments, no doubt, Mr. Cripps, that it ought to be a lower figure for the remainder of the distance; and we shall have the advantage of hearing Mr. Bruce Thomas urging possibly—I am not saying that he will—that the same sum ought to be inserted per mile. That will be the time, when we have got greater experience, and more figures before us, to say whether we think a principle which the form allows to be carried into effect should in fact be carried into effect. That will provide, I hope, in a measure, and in the only way in which to-day we can provide for it, for the point which has been pressed upon us by the County Council. To that extent, we are trying as far as we can, when we are providing a form, to provide a form which will enable that to be carried into effect when the question of *quantum* comes to be considered. So much for that.

Then the other point which Mr. Stafford Cripps very strongly urged is this, and he put it very clearly and very well. He said if you adopt this $1\frac{1}{2}$ mile, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, then $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles, and $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles, and so on, you are, so to speak, stepping into a thing which may be a pitfall for you, because afterwards the Railway Companies will rise and say: "Why on earth did you have that division into $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles and $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles, and so on, unless you meant to attach some monetary consideration to each of the breaks." I think that was the argument which was pressed upon us by the County Council. Here again, in adopting this form with these breaks, we do not consider that we in any sense are bound to give monetary expression necessarily to each of these breaks. I understand that was conceded by the Railway Companies; but if it is not conceded, I wish to make it plain that, in adopting this form, we do not consider ourselves bound to give monetary value for these distances which are put in as differentiations of mileage. I do not say what we might do. We might take two or three together and put the same figure in. I only give that by way of illustration. I cannot possibly say what we shall do; but it is open to us to make any graduation that we like down that scale of figures which has been put there, and to alter or correct the money figures of these figures in the scale as we think right when the matter comes before us. I think that really answers the two principal points which have been raised by the London County Council. To that extent, we

meet the views which they have given expression to, and make it possible for this Tribunal, in adopting this form, to take into consideration what the County Council have urged, and to give effect to it; but we are not at all committing ourselves to one view or the other. We are merely here on the question of the form to-day, and we do not propose to go beyond it.

There are only two or three minor points really which have been raised in the course of the discussion. I think Alderman Dew suggested that the heading was not right. He said he did not like the phrase: "Where workmen's tickets are from time to time issued." He rather urged us to take a wider and bolder course, and to adopt some form of heading which would make it possible for people to think they had an unqualified right to these workmen's tickets at any station on any line of any railway. We need not enter into the matter in full detail; we cannot do that; and we can only provide a standard where workmen's tickets are issued in accordance with the general law, or the law of 1883, or otherwise where it may be necessary to issue them, or where the Companies voluntarily issue them of their own accord by agreement. I think really the heading ought to run more in this way: "Provisional proposals of the Railway Companies in respect of the form of schedule of charges for the conveyance of workmen between such points and hours as workmen's tickets are from time to time issued." I think then that would make it, as it ought to be, a definite statement that this was not a generalisation or an autocratic power exercised on our part of granting workmen's fares, but regulations, where workmen's tickets were used, as to the fares which should be charged. I do not know really whether there are any other points on this schedule, except the question of tools. Both my colleagues are of opinion that no case has been made for the extension of the 60 lb. weight of tools. As I understand it, they would not be really allowed to take the tools as personal luggage, and it is in that sense a concession to them. On the other hand, you may say as they are travelling by a third class ticket, why should not they take luggage? This is a sort of compromise between the two. They are to have 60 lbs. of weight of tools, in order to enable them to ply their avocations where they go to.

I do not know whether there is any other point. I did not propose to put anything about tickets, but if you like to have inserted in blank the suggestion of the other side that provision shall be made for the sale of tickets at the rate of so many per weekly tickets, you can put it in in blank; it does not make much odds. If you attach any value to that for subsequent decision, we can have that put in.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: We do attach some value to it.

President: We will have that put in. You understand what I mean?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: We shall have to argue hereafter whether or not workmen should have a weekly ticket at less than six.

President: Yes, at less, or whatever he suggested was the time.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: There is one other point, and that is the wording point.

President: As to the wording, you have no doubt altered that already—exceeding 1 mile and not exceeding one and one-third all down the schedule.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I was only wondering whether you intended to deal with the minimum charge—the notes at the bottom—"The minimum charge is half one mile, and fractions of half a mile to be charged at half a mile."

President: Yes, I see that is marked.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Then it comes into line with the schedule for ordinary fares that has been supplied already. I think they are necessary additions.

President: Very good. The gentleman from Wales addressed us upon this point. He must not think because I have not dealt with his point that it has been at all overlooked or forgotten by us; it has not. He wants us to make some declaration in his favour

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

that the privilege that he is entitled to shall not now be taken away from him by anything done under the deposit of this schedule. You know as well as I do how the matter stands, do not you? Under Section 34 all the existing statutory and other agreements as to charges are repealed, with certain exceptions in Section 34 (2). You will either come within those, or you will not. I cannot give you any relief in that sense; I can only repeat what the Companies have repeated to me, that so far as possible—and I dare say Mr. Bruce Thomas would again give you the assurance—the existing arrangements will not be disturbed by the adoption of a standard for these working-class fares. More than that I cannot say, and more than that, I suppose, Mr. Bruce Thomas cannot say.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I am afraid we cannot go further than we have already put into writing to this gentleman.

President: I have not power to do anything more for you. I have impressed it upon the Railway Companies and the Railway Companies have impressed upon you, as I understand, by correspondence that, so far as possible, they will preserve your position. I have no power to compel them to keep your position exactly as it was.

Mr. William Strang: On behalf of South Wales we thank you for that expression of opinion, and we take it from you in the spirit in which it is said. The real difficulty was that many of these collieries have for the last 40 years, and in some cases longer, had an agreement with the Railway Companies in regard to these colliers' fares. When the Railway Act came into operation the Railway Companies said that the trader has some protection under Section 34. The Railway Companies then make use of certain clauses in these particular agreements which state that they can be terminated at the end of a month's notice, and they terminate these agreements and close the avenue of Section 34 after an existence of 40 years of acting under the agreement. They close that avenue to the coal owners of South Wales, who felt, naturally, that Section 34 was a very valuable Clause to them, because these colliers' fares are not fixed on the basis of the evidence which has been given to you by the County

Council to-day. They are fixed on the fact of a very valuable consideration to the Railway Companies in regard to haulage of pit wood, coal and all the rest of it. All those things are taken into consideration. We felt it very hard indeed that the Railway Companies, by their action in determining this agreement—it is the first time they have done it—had made use of that Clause, and placed the coal owners of South Wales in a very awkward position indeed, because now we are shut out by the termination of this agreement, from the protection of Section 34, and we are placed under a permissive Clause only, Section 41. We felt we ought to bring such a state of affairs as that to the notice of this impartial Tribunal, so that the question of colliers' fares in South Wales would not be prejudiced by the determination of any schedule of charges which related primarily and solely to cases where tickets are used, and where the Railway Companies have to provide the stock and to take the risk and everything else, which does not obtain in South Wales because they issue no tickets, generally speaking and in many cases the colliery owners provide the stock and also part of the lines over which the train runs. However, we are quite satisfied with your expression of opinion.

Mr. Locket: If the learned President will allow me, I should like to emphasise the point that we have preserved the power to apply, if we consider it right, at a later stage, the two principles upon which Mr. Cripps laid such great stress, namely, the relation of workmen's fares to third-class fares, and also the principle of tapering. Whether we shall apply those when we come to deal with the question of the rates themselves is a matter that we have not decided to-day by our judgment, but the power to do so is preserved. That is the reason very largely why I have personally preferred the proposal of the Railway Companies to the proposal of the London County Council, because it seems to me that it would be easier if we do decide to apply those principles, in this case to do so, than it would be in the rather complicated scheme which was put before us by the London County Council.

SEASON TICKETS.

President: We will proceed with the proposals as to Season Tickets now.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: If you please. As to these proposals by the Railway Companies in respect of the form of schedule of rates for ordinary season tickets, I do not think that the form itself will afford much ground for discussion. We have put forward in the form how one finds certain scales to-day. The periods which are provided for in this form of 12 months, 6 months, 3 months, and 1 month follow what I am instructed is the universal practice. I do not think I need make any observations on the form. The first note on the schedule is: "Minimum charge as for one mile." That is the universal practice to-day. "Fractions of under half a mile to be dropped." That is the universal practice. "Fractions of half a mile and over to be charged as one mile." That again is the universal practice. I believe that the principal discussion will be found to arise in the next two notes. The first one provides that "Passengers under 16 years of age to be charged half the above rates when the tickets are required for residential purposes only." That is the present practice. The next provision is: "Passengers under 18 years of age to be charged half the above rates when the tickets are required for residential purposes only and the salary, wages, remuneration and income (either separately or in the aggregate) of the passenger does not exceed 18s. per week." The practice at present is that scholars, students, apprentices, articulated clerks and articulated pupils who are 16 years of age and not over 18, and who are in receipt of salary, wages, or monetary consideration not exceeding 18s., are given half rates. You will see the proposal that is contained in the print is an extension of the present

practice. The present half rates are only given to scholars, students, apprentices and articulated clerks and articulated pupils.

President: Is that under 18?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes, under 18, whereas we now propose that anybody who is under 18 may get the half rate for residential purposes only, provided that his salary does not exceed 18s. a week. It is not limited to any particular class of persons. I would like upon this question to refer, if I may, to a passage in the Report of the Rates Advisory Committee which dealt with this particular point. It is the Report of the Rates Advisory Committee of the 23rd July, 1920. The following was the recommendation they made with regard to what they term "Junior Workers' Season Tickets." It is on page 9. The recommendation was this: "Junior Workers' Season Tickets. Prior to the War season tickets were issued at half the ordinary rate: (a) to children under 15 years of age." So that you will see now that we have gone up in our present proposals one year. The Rates Advisory Committee also went up one year. "(b) To pupil teachers, scholars, students, medical students, art students, apprentices and articulated clerks who were learning a trade or profession, also to junior clerks and messengers up to the age in each case of 18 years. As from the 1st April, 1920, season tickets have been issued at half the ordinary rate for residential purposes only: (a) To all applicants under 16 years of age; (b) To scholars, students and apprentices, including articulated clerks or articulated pupils (not in receipt of salary, wages or any monetary allowances whatsoever), under the age of 18." Then the Committee state:

30 May, 1929.]

[Continued.]

"We think that the later practice should be continued, but if the charge for season tickets is increased as recommended by us we recommend and advise that the benefit of season tickets at half the ordinary rates should be extended to the classes above-named who are in receipt of nominal salary, wages or remuneration, which for this purpose we think should be taken to mean not more than 18s. per week, the other conditions attached to the issue of such tickets at the present time being maintained." The direction of the Minister of Transport I think followed that recommendation. The season tickets were increased and the 18s. was inserted as the nominal monetary consideration. You will observe that it was in the year 1920, when, perhaps, wages were at their highest level, that that figure of 18s. was suggested by the Rates Advisory Committee and adopted by the Minister. Our submission is that, in continuing that figure to-day, we are at least doing what is reasonable.

President: You said it was your old practice with regard to passengers under 18. Is that so?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No, the present practice.

President: When does it date from, giving this indulgence to people under 18? From what year is it? Is it only 1920?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No, I think there are two stages in it. It was in 1920 that the 18s. limitation was first introduced.

President: Was it without limitation before that?

Mr. Jepson: It says: "No monetary allowance whatever."

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Before that date no one got the benefit who got any salary at all.

President: That is it.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Jepson: That was the grievance before the Rates Advisory Committee, that when people were getting a nominal salary of 5s. or 10s. a week they were debarred from getting these tickets.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: They were debarred from getting the half rate.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Here is a pre-war one. (Document handed.)

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Prior to the inquiry before the Rates Advisory Committee persons between 16 and 18 could not get a season ticket if they got even quite a nominal wage.

President: I am told that is not so.

Mr. Stafford Cripps: Here is a figure of 10s. in this one, which is the South Eastern before the War.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I am afraid I have got it wrong. I think it is correctly stated in the Report. Prior to the war season tickets were issued at half the ordinary rates to pupil-teachers and certain other classes who were learning a trade up to the age in each case of 18 years. Then in April, 1920, the Railway Companies issued half-rate tickets to all applicants first under 16 years of age—there was no qualification as to class or wage—provided they were being used for residential purposes. Then to scholars, students and to apprentices not in receipt of any salary under the age of 18. Then came the recommendation of the Rates Advisory Committee and they said: Well, we think that the later practice should be continued with this exception, that a person under 18, if otherwise entitled to get a half-rate ticket, should not be debarred if he only gets a nominal salary, and we fix the nominal salary at 18s.

Mr. Locket: In October, 1914, it appears that the South Eastern and Chatham Railway issued these tickets at reduced rates, which were at two-thirds the ordinary rates—not half, so that the practice was not apparently universal.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I am told that there was not uniformity in that matter.

Mr. Locket: Apparently not.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: If I might just turn to our proposal with regard to passengers under 18, the only restrictions are that the tickets should be used for residential purposes and that the salary, wages, remuneration or income of the passenger should not exceed 18s. We do not restrict it to any particular

class of persons. Then we provide that persons travelling with ordinary season tickets may take with them the same quantity of luggage as persons travelling with ordinary tickets.

President: There is a point raised in the objection that there is no provision made where more than one season ticket is taken out in a family. What are you going to do about that?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: We do not propose to make any abatement in those cases. No abatements are made to-day. These abatements were given up, I do not know exactly when, but some few years ago.

President: Were they given up during the war, or something like that?

Mr. Locket: They were in existence up to the war. *Mr. Bruce Thomas:* They were in existence during the war I believe. They were stopped in 1918.

Mr. Jepson: Was that practice universal on all railways or was it confined to certain railways only?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No, it was not universal. It was not in operation on the Great Northern or on the Midland, and to a very slight extent, if at all, on the North Western, but my witnesses will be able to give you this information exactly.

Mr. Locket: It was a rebate of 10 per cent.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I have got this out in the form of a statement. Perhaps I had better hand it in. (Document handed in.) This is a statement we have got out at the request of my friend Mr. Purchase, who wanted to know the extent to which these abatements were given in the past. You will find that the Cheshire Line Committee gave it over the whole system, and that the Great Northern did not give it at all. The Great Western gave it, and the Lancashire and Yorkshire. The London and North Western only gave an abatement at competitive points when competing with a company that gave the abatement. The Midland gave the abatement at Leeds, Bradford and Ilkley. It was withdrawn in 1918 for reasons that Mr. Birch-Thorpe, who is very familiar with these arrangements, will give you, and for the reasons they were withdrawn we propose that the practice should not be reinstated. One reason is this. It seems to us that where you get in one household the head of the family, and very likely two or three sons earning their own livelihood and living at home, there is no reason why they should get an abatement.

President: The answer to that is that a great many companies have done it. If your answer was conclusive it would never have been done.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No, but it was withdrawn for a reason. Of course if a thing is once done it does not follow, in my submission, that it ought to have been done and ought always to be continued to be done.

President: No one's conduct could be scrutinized by that rule, no doubt.

Mr. Locket: It was withdrawn under the first revision of rates by the Minister?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes.

Mr. Locket: Was it withdrawn before that?

Mr. Birch-Thorpe: It was withdrawn in 1918, when the Minister withdrew all special concessions.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Mr. Thorpe is much more familiar with this particular point. I am not familiar with it at all, and I would like to get him to deal with it. Then the final provision with regard to luggage is that those travelling at half rates may take half of the allowances specified. There is one reservation that we wish to make with regard to those allowances. I think perhaps it should have appeared on the proposals but it was overlooked, and I think also it should appear in the Schedule relating to ordinary passenger fares, and I am going to ask that it should be inserted upon that Schedule. It is this. There are a number of tramways which now form part of the systems of the grouped railways where the present allowance of luggage is only 28 lbs. and where there is really no accommodation for carrying more than that. In one instance the provision is that passengers may take hand luggage only. We are asking the Tribunal to preserve these

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

exceptions both on this Schedule and the Schedule which relates to ordinary passenger fares of the allowances of luggage that are permitted to ordinary passengers. I will just hand up a short statement of these examples. On the North-Eastern there is the Wisbech and Upwell tramway, and on the London, Midland and Scottish, the Burton and Ashby and Wolverton and Stony Stratford, and then on the Southern Railway there is the Waterloo and City, which is not a tramway, but that is a part of the Southern Railway where the allowance of luggage is 25 lbs., and where there is no accommodation for carrying the luggage which would be permitted if the ordinary allowances were made. We ask that these exceptions should appear on the other Schedule that I have referred to.

The principal objections which are made, to take them in the order they come, are first by the Kingston District Association of Railway Users. They raise an objection to the half rates for persons under 16 being limited to persons who do not earn more than 18s. a week. Their proposal is that anybody under 18 should get a half rate whatever salary he may be earning. Well, our submission upon that is that when people are getting more than 18s. a week they ought not to be entitled to the half rate. When they are under 16 they do get the half rate provided it is used for residential purposes without any restrictions. The point of limiting these tickets for persons who use them for residential purposes only is to exclude tradesmen taking out tickets for messenger boys under 16 who might be using them for the ordinary business of their employers. Then the next objection that I have is that of the County Council. They merely ask that the income should be struck out.

President: The figure of 18s.?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes; to be left blank, I suppose.

Mr. Cripps: That is left for some figure to be put in by the Tribunal, not 18s.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: It is some other figure. The present words with regard to income are: "In receipt of salary, wages or monetary consideration." We thought the new wording was better: "Remuneration and income," because it appears to us that if anybody under 18 has got from some source or other any allowance from parents or whoever it may be, and also he is earning something more, there is no reason why he should get this half rate ticket. A person who is earning 18s. and getting £1 a week from another source would be in a better position than one who is earning 20s. a week, although the 20s. person would be financially in a worse position.

Mr. Jepson: It does seem to raise a lot of difficulties by putting in the words "and income." Supposing there is a youngster earning 18s. a week and his father gave him 2s. 6d. a week pocket money, is that going to debar him from getting a ticket? The word "income" does seem to bring him within that category. Remuneration of 18s. seems to be all right, because that is remuneration for services. But supposing he does get some pocket money given him at home, is that to be treated as part of his income, and does not that imply, if that is so, that there must be a lot of inquiries whether he does get pocket money, or some other allowance, from his parents?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: That would not be income, as a matter of fact. If you strike it out and leave "remuneration," supposing a person of 18 has an allowance of £100 a year, he would have an advantage, as an allowance from his parents is not income; at least, it is not income within the meaning of the Income Tax Acts. If a person under 18 has in fact an income of his own, there is no reason why he should get the half rate.

Mr. Jepson: I quite agree, but it was just on the meaning of the words. It does not mean that the booking clerk or station master at the issuing station is going to make a lot of enquiries as to the man's income.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No. I suppose they have to fill up a form. I have a form before me: "I certify

that the above named under 18 years of age is a scholar attending a course of instruction, or is an apprentice, or something else, and is in receipt of salary, wages, or monetary allowance of blank shillings per week, and that the season ticket is required for residential purposes, and will not be used for business purposes."

Mr. Jepson: That is the old form, but that is to be altered to meet the new requirements.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Some form will have to be filled up in future.

Mr. Jepson: Only with regard to his remuneration—that he is under 18, and his remuneration or income does not exceed 18s. a week. I suppose that a certificate would be given.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I imagine the only person who could say that he has not got an income would be the boy himself.

Mr. Locket: That form was intended to be filled up by his employer.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: That is the employer's form.

Mr. Locket: How is the employer to know that he has no private income?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I do not suggest he will be able to give any information as to the boy's private income, but the boy himself will do that.

Mr. Locket: On his own application form for the ticket?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes. I do not think we are wedded to the word "income." We have no intention of catching the boy who gets that half-crown that Mr. Jepson referred to. We would be quite content to say "salary, wages, or other monetary allowance," but I do not know that that would be any better. That might catch the half-crown, although "income" would not.

Mr. Jepson: We had better leave it.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Then there is the objection which is put forward by the National Association of Railway Travellers, and this I shall have to deal with. I was wrong when I said that there was no objection to the form. Really there is an objection to the form here, because this Association asks for two standard scales. They ask that the column under "Twelve Months" should be divided into two, and that you should have two scales, one which they call "the suburban scale," and another, which would be a slightly higher scale, which is called "the ordinary scale." If I am right, their objection is this: "Take notice that the National Association of Railway Travellers, whose address is 79, Queen Street, desires to be heard," etc., and, "that objections to such proposals will be made on the following grounds."

President: You need not read it all. We have it before us.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I must read a little of it because I have to deal with it.

President: I only meant to say that both myself and my colleagues have already studied it.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: You will see that their proposal is that there should be two rates for season ticket holders, one being a rate for passengers using sections of the railways between different centres of population and their outskirts, and health resorts for residential purposes, and the other a general rate covering distances not comprised in the first category, and that there should be two different "standard rates"—the "suburban scale," and the "ordinary scale," and that those main divisions "should correspond with the main divisions and should be included in the form of a schedule."

President: Then they define "suburban" as between any station within a radius of 8 miles from the City of London, and stations 75 miles or under distant from the City of London, and any station within boroughs and districts of a population of 20,000, and stations within 50 miles distant.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Let us see what that would mean. Take their suburban scale. That would cover 90 per cent. roughly of the season tickets which are issued. The suburban scale would, in fact, be our scale, but 10 per cent. of the people roughly would

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

be in the ordinary scale, and they would pay a bit more than they would pay under the proposals of the railway companies, because the railway companies propose to have one scale only. These objectors suggest two scales. Then you would have this further curious result upon their proposals for a suburban scale which is to operate between stations 75 miles from London and stations within 8 miles of it, that the person who wanted to travel from a station outside the 8 mile limit would have to pay at a higher rate than the person who travels within the 8 mile limit; that is to say, a person travelling between two small towns or between two villages outside the 8 mile area would have to pay more than a person travelling between two places with populations of more than 20,000. Then they suggest upon half-rate tickets that they should be granted without the limitation for residential purposes. We submit that it is not reasonable that they should be allowed to be used for ordinary business purposes. That is not the intention, and never has been the intention, in any case. It is pointed out to me in that case it would be giving an advantage not to the holder of the ticket, who is the person it is intended to benefit, but it would be giving an advantage to his employer. Then they suggest that 18s. should be turned into 30s. to correspond with the increased cost of living since the 18s. limit was originally imposed. I think that is a slip.

President: It must be a little slip.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I thought it had dropped a bit since 1919. They raise the question of the abatement which was knocked off in 1918, particulars of which I have already given. With the assistance of my friend, I will just call Mr. Birch-Thorpe to deal with the proposals.

President: Have you got the objection of the Scottish Education Authority, which suggests that children under 14 should be taken at a third fare?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes, I had a note about it. The facts are, I think, as stated in the objection, and all we can say upon it is this. Those are exceptional arrangements that are in force in one part of the country only. Whether it will be possible to retain those exceptional arrangements in the future I am not able to say, because one has to consider now that the Scottish Railways form part of the English Railways, whether there is any justification for giving in Scotland greater advantages than are given in

England. One can quite imagine that objection might be taken on the part of the users of railways in England to these benefits being maintained. It might be said: Why should you give these people in Scotland greater advantages than are given in England? It is purely a question of continuing existing exceptions, and we suggest that it is not a matter really which can arise upon the consideration of this standard.

President: You might state what you propose to do or what you think of it. I do not suppose you will care to terminate such a thing as this abruptly?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No, I am told that there is no present intention of doing so, but I feel I could not commit myself to a statement that it will not be terminated after the appointed day, but it had not so far entered the minds of those who are instructing me to terminate it.

President: It had not.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: It had not been brought before them. They had not considered it as one of the things that in the future will have to be determined. Whether or not it will be determined I really cannot say, because there may be objection in the new state of affairs to continuing advantages in Scotland which are not given to similar persons in this country. I think I can say that we should not terminate these arrangements without giving ample notice and opportunity for discussion with the authorities. I do not feel that I can say more than that. It is to be borne in mind that these half-rates are to help persons who are learning trades or going to school and who have to bear this charge out of their own pocket. The charge in Scotland, as I understand the objection, falls upon the Education Authorities. It is rather difficult to see how that exceptional matter can be considered as relevant when you are determining the standard.

President: In any case they get the benefit of the half-rate, I understand, under 16?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: They get the half-rate.

Mr. Jepson: Is there any provision—I am not sure if there is—under the Act by which if the Education Authorities felt themselves aggrieved by the way in which the application to the Railway Companies was met they would have an appeal to this Tribunal?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Nobody would have an appeal on passenger fares.

Mr. Jepson: That is what I thought.

Mr. CHARLES EDWIN BIRCH-THORPE,

sworn. Examined by Mr. TYLOR.

614. You are, I think, Chief Season Ticket Clerk to the London Midland & Scottish Railway Company?—Yes.

615. You had occupied the same position previously on the Midland Railway?—That is so.

616. You are also Chairman of the Clearing House Season Ticket Conference?—Yes.

617. Before you deal with the objections that have been lodged to your proposals, I want you to deal quite shortly with the form of your proposals. First, as regards the periods which you propose of 12 months, six months, three months, and one month, has it been the practice of all the Railway Companies to issue season tickets for those periods?—Yes.

618. So that you are continuing the previous practice?—That is so.

619. With regard to the first note: "Minimum charge as for one mile," that too, I believe, has been the universal practice?—It has.

620. With regard to the next note: "Fractions of under half a mile to be dropped," and the next one, "Fractions of half a mile and over to be charged as one mile," the same thing is to be said about that?—Yes.

621. With regard to the half-rate tickets for children who are passengers under 16 years of age and under 18 years of age, subject to the qualifications set out, you have extended this principle to the two classes for residential purposes only?—That was put in in 1920. The residential clause we are still continuing with the reservation that they shall be for residential purposes only.

622. In the case of passengers under 18 years of age, it is to be subject to the condition that the salary, wages, remuneration and income should not exceed 18s. a week?—That is so.

623. That is a slight alteration on your previous practice, is not it, by which you have extended this class of passenger to those to whom you previously made the allowance of half rates?—Yes. Prior to the direction in 1920 the tickets were only issued to certain people. It was felt then that there should be uniformity between all the railway companies, and they decided that the half-rate should be given to certain persons. When the recommendation was made by the Rates Advisory Committee, we suggested that the tickets should be given at the half rate to those certain people who were not in receipt of wages at all, but the Rates Advisory Committee considered that it should be given to those receiving not exceeding 18s. a week, I suppose 18s. being then considered a nominal sum, and the Minister of Transport confirmed that recommendation and issued that direction accordingly.

624. *Mr. Locket:* What was the practice of your railway before the war?—We had no wage limit, but it was confined to certain people. It was not given to everybody under 18 years.

625. Whatever wages they were earning?—There was no wage limit.

626. Whatever wages they were earning?—Yes, but it was confined to certain classes of persons.

627. But within those classes the individual might be earning 30s. or 40s. a week?—Wages were then

30 May, 1923.]

MR. CHARLES EDWIN BIRCH-THORPE.

[Continued.]

very low, but some companies had a reservation to those not receiving wages at all.

625. I see the South Eastern & Chatham had a reservation of 18s. a week?—There was no uniformity between the railway companies, but it was obtained after that recommendation was made to the Ministry of Transport.

629. *Mr. Tylor*: At the time you are speaking of, when it was limited to certain persons, were the persons to whom it was limited all of a class who would not be earning wages?—Or very small wages.

630. It was limited to apprentices, articled clerks, articled pupils, and so on, who would not be earning wages at any rate in excess of 18s. a week?—Quite so.

631. With regard to passengers' luggage, the allowances are the same as in the case of a passenger holding an ordinary ticket?—That is so.

632. Mr. Bruce Thomas has dealt with the case of certain tramways on which at present there is no provision for the same luggage allowance?—Yes.

633. I think we can deal now with the objections. The first objection is the objection of the Kingston District Association of Railway Users?—Yes.

Mr. Jepson: Before you get to that objection there is one point which occurs to me as to the question of luggage. I am not quite sure what the phrase is on the form that the Tribunal has already settled for ordinary passengers. Is it limited there to the luggage that people may carry when they are paying the full standard fare, or does it say an ordinary passenger 1st class, 2nd class and 3rd class?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: The note under the schedule that is settled is: "Every passenger carried at the above standard fares may take with him the following amounts of ordinary luggage."

Mr. Jepson: The same difficulty arises on that clause. The suggestion is, if there is anything in the way of deduction from the standard, either in the ordinary form or on the season ticket scale, that these luggage allowances do not apply. Here it says: "Every passenger carried at the above standard rates may take with him" and so on, and the same thing apparently appears in the schedule for ordinary fares. It is not intended by the railway company that if there is any reduction in the ordinary fare below the standard—such cases as you mentioned just now—that the luggage allowance was altered.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: No; I do not suppose there is for a moment, but it does not follow that a person who is travelling at a special excursion rate is entitled to take 150lb. of luggage.

Mr. Jepson: No; I quite agree; but it is the intention of the railway companies that persons booking by ordinary fares, although they may be a little below the standard, may have these allowances of luggage.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I have no doubt that was the intention.

Mr. Jepson: It is not clear.

Mr. Bruce Thomas: I have not heard the contrary suggested.

Mr. Locket: In practice you allow the ordinary amount of luggage for tourist tickets which are considerably below the standard?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes; but not on the special day excursions.

634. *Mr. Tylor*: We were dealing with the first objection of the Kingston District Association of Railway Users. Their objection is to the condition that, in the case of half-rate season tickets for passengers under 18, the income of the passenger shall not exceed 18s. a week. What is your answer to that objection?—Their objection is that it should be issued irrespective of that. We think it is a fair and reasonable proposition now that the limit should be 18s. per week. 18s. was fixed by the Ministry of Transport as what was then a nominal wage, and although wages have since dropped, we are not proposing to drop the minimum of 18s., so that the passenger would be enjoying a greater facility at the present time than he has enjoyed in the past. Moreover, we are throwing it open to every class of passenger under 18 years of age, provided he is not

getting more than 18s. per week. We think that is a fairly reasonable limit.

635. So much for that objection. That answer of yours deals with the objection of the London County Council which objects to the figure of 18s. as the limit of income?—Yes.

Mr. Jepson: And the objection of the National Association of Railway Travellers also. They want 30s.?

636. *Mr. Tylor*: Yes. The next objection I want to deal with is the National Association of Railway Travellers. Their objections have been dealt with by my friend. Their objections include the proposal for a different form of schedule setting up two scales. Mr. Bruce Thomas has referred to them, and I want you to deal with them and give your reasons why you are not prepared to accept them. The first objection is a proposal that the form of the scale should be altered, and that two scales should be set up, one a suburban scale, and, secondly, an ordinary scale. They have been described by Mr. Bruce Thomas, and they are before the Tribunal. Would you just give your reasons why you are not prepared to accept them?—In the past every Railway Company has had a separate scale of its own, for instance, up to 30 miles, the evidence as to which I gave the last time I was here. There was also a well defined scale for distances over 30 miles, which was adopted by some Companies entirely, and by others when they come into contact with another Company on a through ticket. It has, however, been decided that we are to get a standard scale if possible to fit all the Companies, and our intention is to submit a scale to you which will run in proper gradations from 1 mile right up to 1,000 miles, if necessary. They will be the one scale that we shall place before you. We could not possibly adopt the suggestion made here, because it would be unworkable. If you take the case of persons travelling between any large town, or from any large town, the whole of the United Kingdom would be covered by those areas of 75 and 50 miles. Moreover, as Mr. Bruce Thomas has said, of the total issue of season tickets, 90 per cent. are for distances under 40 miles. The only person who would have to pay on the second scale, which they term the ordinary scale, would be individuals who live between the populous places and wanted to travel for only short distances. Their percentage of tickets for the shorter distances would only be 3 per cent. Mr. Bruce Thomas mentioned 10 per cent. but that covers all the rest of the tickets we issue above 40 miles. I think it would be found it would be 3 per cent. of the people who would be affected by the second scale.

637. *Mr. Bruce Thomas*: The other 7 per cent. are traders' tickets?—Yes.

638. *Mr. Tylor*: The proposal that the Railway Companies have put forward is in accordance with the recommendation that was given by the Rates Advisory Committee?—That is so. We are endeavouring to present a standard scale working up from 1 mile, let us say, to possibly 1,000 miles or over.

639. I think you have found in practice with the distances over 30 miles the decrease will be more marked as the distance increases?—That is our intention—to have a tapering scale as we go along, for those distances.

640. After 30 miles the tapering becomes more acute?—That is so.

641. The further it goes after the 30 miles?—Yes, on the assumption that fewer journeys will be made with the longer distance tickets.

642. So that really gives effect to the first part of the proposal of these objectors to the tapering scale for distance?—Distances up to 75 miles, exactly.

643. With regard to the second objection of the National Association of Railway Travellers, it is that there is no need in the case of passengers under 16 that there should be the limitation imposed by the words: "When the tickets are required for residential purposes only," and they propose that those words should be struck out. What reason have you for retaining those words, "for residential purposes

30 May, 1923.]

Mr. CHARLES EDWIN BIRCH-THORPE.

[Continued.]

only"?—We found that, prior to 1920, many business firms were taking out these half-rate tickets for their messengers and other people, for conveying goods or parcels or for other business purposes. We felt that the half-rate ticket was not intended for the benefit of those people for business purposes, but was intended for the benefit of those under 16 years of age attending school or college, or just learning a trade.

644. The third objection as to the limitation to 18s. you have already dealt with?—Yes.

645. The fourth objection is your failure to make any provision for an abatement which in certain instances has been made in the case of numbers of members of the same family taking out season tickets on the same railway?—Yes.

646. This was the practice of the railway companies, or of some of them, I believe, before it was discontinued in May, 1918?—Yes.

647. I think it is the fact in the case of the Great Northern Railway Company it was not the practice, and in the case of the London and North Western an abatement was only made at competitive points where the competing company made the abatement, and in the case of the Midland Railway Company only at Leeds, Bradford, and Ilkley?—That is so.

648. A table has been handed in showing the extent to which it was made?—Yes.

649. Was this arrangement in which an abatement was given in certain cases discontinued in May, 1918?—It was discontinued by the Ministry of Transport when they gave instructions that all cheap rates in connection with cheap season tickets were to be cancelled for the time being.

650. Mr. Jepson: It was not done by the Ministry of Transport in 1918?—It was the Railway Executive.

651. It may have been the Board of Trade?—Yes.

652. I suppose the Board of Trade under D.O.R.A. stopped it?—Yes. Although the railway companies have since had an opportunity of reinstating those facilities, they have deemed it undesirable to do so, because we found that when it was in operation it was subject to so much abuse. Moreover, it was a distinct loss of revenue, and we do not think it should be continued. At the present time no company is putting it into operation. Abuse occurred in cases where grown-up sons got married and left home, and they still continued to apply from the same address and get these tickets at the cheap rate. We found people living in the same house claimed to be relations, because some railway companies did not always say they must be members of the same family. Although they appeared here as members of the same family, it is the same as if some of them resided in the same house. It was found that was abused; in fact, in the case of one company, on an application from four people who said they were cousins, on testing them they were each found to be of a different nationality.

653. President: They may have been cousins all the same.—We found people were claiming the abatement, as Mr. Bruce Thomas has said, when they were grown-up persons in the household who were earning their own living. The companies felt that it was not desirable to reinstitute the practice, and they have not done so.

654. Mr. Taylor: You have decided not to reinstitute it, after considering all the pros and cons?—Yes. The question was discussed by all the railway companies at the Clearing House, and it was eventually decided they did not think it was desirable to reinstitute that practice.

655. Mr. Jepson: It was originally instituted to attract people to live a little way out from their own place of business?—Yes; to offer them an inducement to go out to some country place. That was the idea. Moreover, the abatement had certain conditions, some companies limiting it to tickets for a certain period, and most of them to tickets to the same point; so that it was not given indiscriminately to allow them to travel anywhere. There were certain limitations put on them by every company. You will notice, too, that on the list in connection with the

wife it says: "50 per cent. reduction." Those reductions were only made when the tickets were used between certain hours, the slack hours during the day, possibly after ten in the morning and before four in the afternoon.

656. The next objector is Mr. Moore, of Eastbourne. He asks that terminal rates should be given for season tickets not according to the exact mileage. I am not quite sure myself what he means. Perhaps the best course will be if I leave him to put a question about them, if he is here?—Very well.

President: You will submit the altered form of schedule with regard to workmen's fares, to the Registrar?

Mr. Bruce Thomas: Yes.

President: You have been kind enough, Mr. Davis, to wait for two days here, but I was wondering whether there was anything more that you wished to say than is contained in your letter of the 25th May, which I have got?

Mr. Davis: There is one point. In the past when you wanted a through ticket you could get one from a company when it was on three systems. I think you have a note in front of you of my points?

President: Yes. I will hand a copy to Mr. Bruce Thomas so that he can see it.

Mr. Davis: I am an ordinary season ticket holder and I have always held what is called a heavy season. I am a lover of the country and I always get right out in the country, and I am up against certain points according to the customs of the railway companies. Whether they are met by this new scheme before the Tribunal I do not know; but I will put these objections forward. The first is that no allowance is made, except in the case of illness, by the railway companies on season tickets deposited for a term of four weeks or more. That strikes the ordinary season ticket holder as very unfair. If he purchases any ordinary article and takes it back, generally there is some allowance made.

President: If you went away for a holiday to another place and you did not use your season ticket for four weeks, you would expect an abatement?

Mr. Davis: That is the point.

Mr. Locket: That was the practice before the war.

Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Locket: You could deposit your ticket for a month.

Mr. Davis: Yes; that is right. The second point is the additional charge made in the case of alternative termini. The exact illustration is Marylebone and Paddington. On the yearly season ticket the total charge is £1 5s. Most season ticket holders on that line regard it as what is commonly known as a rush by the railway companies to charge that, because the only thing the ordinary ticket holder gets is the advantage of what is what I may term, at West Wycombe, a rotten service. The company incurs no extra expense in giving that facility. The same trains run whether you use them or not. The same staff is used. There is no extra staff. There is not one item of extra expense incurred by the railway company. When you have a heavy season ticket—the amount is £36, from Farringdon Street to West Wycombe—and get a charge of £1 5s. on a big season ticket like that, I think it is too much to expect for anyone to go and live in the country. The railway companies freeze you out.

Mr. Jepson: What did the £1 5s. represent?

Mr. Davis: The use of either termini, Paddington or Marylebone. If you have a season ticket only available to one the charge is so much, but if you have it available to either terminus, an extra charge of 25s. is made.

Mr. Jepson: Because you take in so much additional distance.

Mr. Davis: But the ordinary return-ticket holder has that privilege. That is my strong point. They do not make any extra charge there.

Mr. Jepson: Anybody going from West Wycombe to Marylebone can come back from Paddington on the same ordinary ticket?

30 May, 1923.]

Mr. CHARLES EDWIN BIRCH-THORPE.

[Continued.]

Mr. Davis: Yes; that is right; without any extra charge, and I submit a season ticket-holder should have the same privilege without extra charge; but on the season ticket they charge yearly £1 6s., and I cannot see the reason for it.

Mr. Locket: Anybody coming to the two termini is on two different systems, one is on the London and North Western Railway to Marylebone, and the other is the Great Western.

Mr. Davis: Yes; but they run jointly the greater part of the distance—90 per cent. of it, or more.

Mr. Locket: There are more striking instances in the south of London where the tickets are not available on stations belonging to the same company. The Southern Railway issues tickets on the Brighton section which are not available on the South Eastern section.

Mr. Davis: I have not come up against that difficulty.

Mr. Locket: That is a more remarkable case than yours.

Mr. Jepson: That cannot be dealt with under this form. It is a matter in which the railway company can take their own action.

Mr. Davis: It affects the charges on season tickets. It affects the rate of season tickets. If they fix a standard rate for season tickets, and then put additional charges on which are not necessary, it does raise a question from my point of view. The third point is that on any season ticket of £20 or over, if you want a monthly ticket they charge you a far greater rate than they do for a quarterly one. The railway company does not run much risk. They are charging you in advance for their services. It seems to me, now that competition is practically abolished and they are a sort of national asset, that it would be quite fair to ask them to issue the monthly ticket at the yearly rate the same as they do the quarterly one, and not put the exorbitant charges on that they do at present. For instance, from Farringdon Street via Marylebone to High Wycombe, the monthly ticket at the yearly rate is £2 12s. 7d., but the monthly ticket taken singly is £2 19s. 3d. That is an extra 6s. 8d. on the month. That works out at about 12 per cent., and I think that charge is altogether too heavy because they run no additional risk. It works out, I should say, at a very heavy percentage reckoning the rate of interest. I consider that is not justified because they do not run any greater risk, and they have the use on a quarterly ticket of money for a short period only, but representing that heavy charge.

Mr. Locket: That was always the case before the war.

Mr. Davis: I believe that is so.

Mr. Locket: The rate for the monthly ticket was higher in proportion.

Mr. Davis: Yes. My point is, now that competition is practically altogether abolished, they should consider the needy people who want to live in the country and relieve the congestion in London. It is a great consideration on a season ticket of £36 or £22, which is as much as a middle-class man can manage. You have to be a great lover of the country to undertake that charge. It seems to me reasonable that a monthly ticket should be issued at one-twelfth of the yearly season ticket for above £20 value.

The other point I want to mention is that, during the war, if you wanted a through ticket from, say, High Wycombe to St. James' Park, or from any point in Bucks, you could not get it; or if you got it it was exactly the same as if you took the ticket from High Wycombe to Paddington, and then took another ordinary ticket from Praed Street to St. James' Park. On the Underground, I believe that ticket from Praed Street to St. James' Park came to £6 or £9 a year. When a man is enthusiastic enough to undertake a journey from High Wycombe to London he is entitled to have a cheap ticket for the remainder of the journey to enable him to get to his business; and I think that provision should be made in this new Act that a through ticket should always be available, even if it is on three systems, at a cheap through rate.

Another point is this. I strongly recommend the idea of tapering off as the distance increases. To the ordinary man, who wants to live in the country for residential purposes, as you increase the distance you increase the time he spends, which is very valuable. A man living in London has a radius for residential purposes, generally, taking it at the extreme, of about 25 or 30 miles. Even if he has short hours, the time spent in the journey probably makes what would be a short hour day into a long hour day. In my case I get short hours, but a certain part of my day is spent in the train, so that I have practically 11 hours a day travelling and at business before I get home. You want a pretty good enthusiasm to undertake that. That is the case of all residential traffic in a radius of about 25 or 30 miles; but the railway companies kill most of that traffic unless you are a great enthusiast, by these heavy season tickets. Therefore, I think they should taper off tremendously after about 20 miles to induce men to live out in the country. I think that is all I have to say.

(Adjourned till to-morrow morning at 10.30.)

30 May, 1923.]

[Continued.]

(Table handed in by Mr. Birch-Thorpe).

FORM OF SCHEDULE OF RATES FOR ORDINARY SEASON TICKETS.

STATEMENT in regard to abatements made to members of the same family taking out Season Tickets on the same railway, and the extent of such abatements.

Prior to May, 1918, the following abatements were made, as a general principle, under the following condition :—

When two or more members of the same family, residing in the same house, take full price Season Tickets between the same Stations, from the same date, for the same period, and for not less than three months.

Company.	Extent of Abatement.	Whether applied over whole system.
O.L.C.	10% for 2 persons	Yes.
	15% for 3 or more persons	
G.C.	" " " " " " " " " " " "	
G.E.	10% for 2 persons	
	15% for 3 or more persons	Yes.
	50% for wife	
G.N.	None.	
G.W.	10% for 2 persons	
	15% for 3 or more persons	Yes.
L. & Y.	10% for 2 persons	
	15% for 3 or more persons	
L. & N.W.	Abatement only allowed at competitive points when competing Company made abatement.	
L. & S.W.	10% for 2 persons	Yes.
	15% for 3 or more persons	
	50% for wife	
L.B. & S.C.	5% for 2 persons	
	10% for 3 persons	Yes.
	15% for 4 or more persons	
	50% for wife	
Met.	10% for 2 persons	Yes.
Dist.	15% for 3 or more persons	
Mid.	Same as N.E. Co., but only at Leeds, Bradford and Ilkley.	
N.E.	5% for 3 persons	
	7½% for 4 persons	Yes.
	10% for 5 or more persons	
S.E. & C.	5% for 2 persons	
	10% for 3 persons	
	15% for 4 or more persons	Yes.
	50% for wife	
Scotland—		
Cal.	5% for 2 persons	Yes.
G. & S.W.	7½% for 3 persons	
N.B.	10% for 4 or more persons	
	50% for wife	

(This arrangement was discontinued in May, 1918, and has not been re-instituted.)

RAILWAY CLEARING HOUSE,

29th May, 1923.

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL OF THE

JOURNAL OF THE

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL

JOURNAL